

MORAL PHILOSOPHY;

OR

THE DUTIES OF MAN

CONSIDERED IN HIS

INDIVIDUAL, DOMESTIC, AND SOCIAL CAPACITIES.

BY

GEORGE COMBE.

THIRD IMPRESSION

OF THE

THIRD EDITION,

REVISED, CORRECTED, AND ENLARGED.

EDINBURGH: MACLACHLAN AND STEWART.

LONDON. SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, AND CO.

1859.

P R E F A C E.

The present work appears in the form of Lectures, which were composed under the following circumstances:—

In 1832, an Association was formed by the industrious classes of Edinburgh, for obtaining instruction in useful and entertaining knowledge, by means of lectures, to be delivered in the evenings after business-hours. These lectures were designed to be popular with regard to style and illustration, but systematic in arrangement and extent. One evening in each week was devoted to Astronomy; two nights to Chemistry; and I was requested to deliver a course on Moral Philosophy, commencing in November 1835, and proceeding on each Monday evening, till April 1836. Thus, there were delivered twenty consecutive lectures on Moral Philosophy, on the Monday evenings; fifty lectures on Chemistry, on the evenings of Tuesdays and Fridays; and twenty-five lectures on Astronomy, on the Thursday evenings. The audience amounted to between five and six hundred persons of both sexes.

In twenty lectures, addressed to such an audience, only a small portion of a very extensive field of science could be touched upon. It was necessary also to avoid, as much as possible, abstract and speculative questions, and to dwell chiefly on topics simple, interesting, and practically useful. These circumstances account for the introduction of many local topics of illustration, and of such subjects as Suretiship, Arbitration, Guardianship, and some others, not usually treated of in works on Moral Philosophy; and also for the occasional omission of that rigid application of the principles on which the work is founded, to the case of every duty, which would have been necessary in a purely scientific treatise. These principles, however, although not always stated, are never intentionally departed from.

A large number of my auditors had studied Phrenology, and many of them had read my work on "The Constitution of Man," in which it is extensively applied to subjects connected with human conduct and duty: I did not hesitate, therefore, to assume the principles of this science as the basis of a sound system of moral philosophy. As, however, my hearers were not, in general, regular students, but persons engaged in practical business, who could not be supposed to have always at command a distinct recollection of their previous knowledge, it became necessary for me to restate these principles at considerable length. This is the cause of a more extensive repetition, in these Lectures, of views already published in "The Constitution of Man," and in my phrenological writings, than, in ordinary circumstances, would have been admissible.

The Lectures were reported, by one of my hearers, in the *Edinburgh Chronicle* newspaper, and excited some attention. Still, however, I did not consider them worthy of being presented to the public as a separate work, and they did not, for some years, appear in this form in Britain. I transmitted a copy of the "Report" to a friend in Boston, U. S., where they were reprinted by Messrs Marsh, Capen, and Lyon, in a small duodecimo volume. The edition was speedily purchased by the American public; and, encouraged by this indication of approval, I published the entire Lectures in that city, during my residence in America, in 1840, with such additions and improvements as they appeared to stand in need of. Since my return to Scotland, I have subjected the volume to another revision, and now offer an improved edition to the British public.

I am aware that, in founding Moral Philosophy on Phrenology, I may appear to those persons who stand in a different position from that of my audience, and who have not ascertained the truth of the latter science, to be resting human duty on a basis of mere conjecture.

In answer to this objection, I respectfully remark, that scientific truths exist independently of human observation and opinion. The globe revolved on its axis, and carried the pope and seven cardinals whirling round on its surface, at the very moment when he and they declared the assertion of such a fact to be a damnable heresy, subversive of Christianity. In like manner, the brain performs its functions equally in those who deny, and in those who admit, its influence. I observe that in one anti-phrenologist, in whom the anterior lobe is small, the intellect is feeble; and that in another, in whom it is large, and well constituted, the intellect is powerful, altogether independently of their own belief in these facts. I have remarked, also, that when the brain of an anti-phrenologist has been diseased in a particular organ, he has become deranged in the corresponding faculty, notwithstanding his denial of all connection between them. The fact, therefore, that many persons do not admit the truth of Phrenology, does not necessarily render it an imaginary science. The denial by Harvey's contemporaries of the circulation of the blood, did not arrest the action of the heart, arteries, and veins.

In Phrenology, as in general Physiology and other sciences, there are points still unascertained, and these may hereafter prove to be important; but the future discovery of the functions

of the spleen, will not overturn the ascertained functions of the lungs or spinal marrow; and in like manner, the disclosure of the uses of certain unknown parts at the base of the brain, will not alter the ascertained functions of the anterior lobe and coronal region. I consider the phrenological principles on which the following Lectures are founded, to be established by such an extensive induction of facts, as will enable them to sustain the severest scrutiny, and not be found wanting; and I shall, with becoming resignation, abide by the verdict of those, who, by study and observation, shall have rendered themselves competent to judge of their merits.

In claiming for Phrenology, in the following pages, the merit of having unfolded new truths for the guidance of human conduct, I have no wish to go a step beyond the limits warranted by the most rigid induction. I am aware that Phrenology has created no new quality, and that every faculty and influence of which it treats existed and operated before Dr Gall was born. Phrenology professes to be nothing more than an accurate description of objects that exist, and their relations. It is equally certain that descriptions, more or less accurate, of the general characters and modes of operation of many of the faculties may be found in the works of even the earliest authors. Still, however, owing to their having possessed no certain means of distinguishing between what is really a primitive faculty, and what is only a mode of action common to many faculties, and owing also to their ignorance of the *organs* of the mind, and of the effects of size in the organs on the powers of manifestation, their knowledge never assumed the certainty and consistency, nor reached the practical character, of a science. The discovery by Dr Gall of the functions of the brain accomplished for the philosophy of mind what the discoveries of Kepler, Copernicus, Galileo, and Newton had previously done for Astronomy; it substituted a basis of facts, ascertainable by observation, for hypothesis and conjecture. It brought to light several elements of human nature which the metaphysicians had failed to discover; gave certainty to the existence of several which had been with them subjects of dispute; while it shed a new light on the effects of the combinations of the faculties in different degrees of relative strength in different individuals. It also enabled philosophers to trace the relations between the mind, and the external world more successfully than when the mental organs were unknown. It is in reference to these improvements that I speak, in the following pages, of Phrenology having unfolded new truths for the guidance of human conduct.

EDINBURGH, 1st October 1840.

ADVERTISEMENT TO THE THIRD EDITION.

A SECOND EDITION of this Work in 12mo, price 7s. 6d., has been in the hands of the Public for some time, and continues to be well received. A Cheap Edition has been repeatedly called for, and is now offered to the People. Several alterations and additions have been introduced; but none of them affect the principles and doctrine originally advanced. Since the Lectures were delivered, Phrenology has made so great a progress in public opinion that the apologetic tone frequently used will already appear to many readers to be antiquated.

45 MELVILLE STREET, EDINBURGH,
31st March 1846.

ADVERTISEMENT.

This Work was Stereotyped for the Third Edition: a Second Impression of it was called for in 1855, on which occasion no alterations or additions were found by the Author to be necessary. A Third Impression of it in the same condition is now issued.

EDINBURGH, 1st July 1859.

CONTENTS.

OF THE FOUNDATIONS OF MORAL SCIENCE,	1
OF THE SANCTIONS BY WHICH THE NATURAL LAWS OF MORALITY ARE SUPPORTED,	8
DUTIES PRESCRIBED TO MAN AS AN INDIVIDUAL, viz.	
Self-Culture,	16
Preserving Bodily and Mental Health,	19
Amusements,	24
MAN CONSIDERED AS A DOMESTIC BEING, viz.	
Marriage,	26
Fidelity to the Marriage Vow,	31
Divorce,	31
Duties of Parents to their Children,	33
Duties of Children to their Parents,	41
MAN CONSIDERED AS A SOCIAL BEING.	
Origin of Society,	43
Origin of Gradations of Rank,	46
Savage, Pastoral, Agricultural, and Commercial Stages of Society,	48
May improvement in the condition of Society be expected?	56
Reasons for expecting future improvement in the condition of Society,	57
DUTIES OF MAN AS A SOCIAL BEING.	
To Support the Poor,	62
Causes of Pauperism and its Remedies,	63
Treatment of Criminals,	67
Guardianship,	85
Suretiship,	86
Duties of Jurors and Arbitrators,	88
OF GOVERNMENT, viz.,—	
The Origin of Government,	90
Independence and Liberty of Nations distinguished,	91
Qualities necessary for securing Independence,	92
Qualities necessary for Liberty,	93
DIFFERENT FORMS OF GOVERNMENT,—	
Despotism—to what circumstances suited,	95
Mixed Form of Government, and its institutions,	96
Democratic Form of Government,	100
DUTIES OF MAN AS A RELIGIOUS BEING.	
Natural Theology a branch of Philosophy,	104
Foundation of Natural Religion,	105
Distinction between Morals and Religion,	106
Moral and Religious Duties prescribed to Man by Natural Theology,	109
Dictates of Natural Theology compared with those of the Ten Commandments,	110
OBJECTIONS CONSIDERED,	113

28792 19/10/2001

MORAL PHILOSOPHY.

LECTURE I.

ON THE FOUNDATION OF MORAL SCIENCE.

Questions distinct, What actions are virtuous? and what constitutes them such?—Answer to the former comparatively easy—Human constitution indicates certain courses of action to be right—Necessity for studying that constitution and its relations, in order to ascertain what renders an action virtuous or vicious—Conflicting opinions of philosophers on the moral constitution of man—Phrenology assumed as a valuable guide—Possibility of the existence of Moral Philosophy as a natural science—No faculty essentially evil, though liable to be abused—Deductions of well-constituted and well-informed minds to be relied on in moral science—Scripture not intended as an all-sufficient guide of conduct—Faculties revealed by Phrenology, and illustrations of their uses and abuses—Adaptation of human constitution to external nature—The objects of Moral Philosophy are, to trace the nature and legitimate sphere of action of our faculties and their external relations, with the conviction that to use them properly is virtue, to abuse them vice—Cause of its barren condition as a science—Bishop Butler's view of the supremacy of conscience acceded to—Those actions virtuous which accord with the harmonious dictates of all our faculties—Preceding theories imperfect, though partially correct—Cause of this imperfection; qualities of actions are discovered by the intellect, and the moral sentiments then decide whether they are right or wrong—Plan of the present course of Lectures.

In an introductory discourse on Moral Philosophy, the lecturer unfortunately has few attractions to offer. His proper duty is, not to descant in glowing terms on the dignity of moral investigations, and on the importance of sound ethical conclusions both to public and to private happiness, but to give an account of the state in which his science at present exists, and of what he means to teach in his subsequent prelections. No subject can be conceived more destitute of direct attraction. I must beg your indulgence, therefore, for the dryness of the details, and the abstractness of the argument, in this lecture. I make these observations, that you may not feel discouraged by an appearance of difficulty in the commencement. I shall use every effort to render the subject intelligible; and I promise you that the subsequent discourses shall be more practical and less abstruse than the present.

Our first inquiry is into the basis of morals regarded as a science; that is, into the natural foundations of moral obligation.

There are two questions—very similar in terms, but widely different in substance—which we must carefully distinguish. The one is, What actions are virtuous? and the other, What constitutes them virtuous? The answer to the first question, fortunately, is not difficult. Most individuals acknowledge that it is virtuous to love our neighbour, to reward a benefactor, to discharge our proper obligations, to love God, and so forth; and that the opposite actions are vicious. But when the second question is put, Why is an action virtuous—why is it virtuous to love our neighbour, or to manifest gratitude or piety?

the most contradictory answers are given by philosophers. The discovery of what constitutes virtue is a fundamental point in moral philosophy; and hence the difficulties of the subject meet us at the very threshold of our inquiries.

It is generally admitted that man has received definite mental and bodily constitutions; and it is in them and their relations that we must seek for the natural foundations of virtue. The knowledge of these constitutions possessed by philosophers has been very imperfect; and hence has arisen much of the obscurity of moral science.

Philosophers have never been agreed about the existence or non-existence in man even of the most important moral emotions,—such as benevolence, and the sentiment of justice; and, being uncertain whether such emotions exist or not, they have had no stable ground from which to start in their inquiries into the foundation of virtue. Since the publication of the writings of Hobbes, in the 17th century, there has been a constant series of disputes among philosophers on this subject. Hobbes taught that the laws which the civil magistrate enjoins are the ultimate standards of morality. Cudworth endeavoured to shew that the origin of our notions of right and wrong is to be found in a particular faculty of the mind which distinguishes truth from falsehood. Mandeville declares that the moral virtues are mere sacrifices of self-interest made for the sake of public approbation, and calls virtue the “political offspring which flattery begot upon pride.” Dr Clarke supposes virtue to consist in acting according to the fitnesses of things. Mr Hume endeavoured to prove that “utility is the constituent or measure of virtue.” Dr Hutcheson maintains that it originates in the dictates of a moral sense. Dr Paley does not admit such a faculty, but declares virtue to consist “in doing good to mankind in obedience to the will of God, and for the sake of everlasting happiness.” Dr Adam Smith endeavours to shew that sympathy is the source of moral approbation. Dr Reid, Mr Stewart, and Dr Thomas Brown, maintain the existence of a moral faculty. Sir James Mackintosh describes conscience to be compounded and made up of associations. Dr Ralph Wardlaw, of Glasgow, in a work on Ethics, published in 1834, can see nothing in Conscience except Judgment.

Here, then, we discover the most extraordinary conflict of opinion prevailing concerning the foundation of virtue. But this does not terminate the points of dispute among philosophers in regard to moral science. Its very existence, nay, the very possibility of its existence, as a philosophical study, is called in question. Dr Wardlaw says, “Suppose that a chemist were desirous to ascertain the ingredients of water. What estimate should we form of his judgement, if, with this view, he were to subject to his analysis a quantity of what had just passed in the bed of a sluggish river, through the midst of a large manufacturing city, from whose common sewers, and other outlets of impurity, it had received every possible contamination which either by simple

admixture or by chemical affinity, had become incorporated with the virgin purity of the fountain; and if, proceeding on such analysis, he were to publish to the world his *thesis* on the composition of water? Little less preposterous must be the conduct of those philosophers who derive their ideas of what constitutes rectitude in morals from human nature *as it is*. They analyze the water of the polluted river, and refuse the guide that would conduct them to the mountain spring of its native purity."—(*Christian Ethics*, p. 44.)

In these remarks Dr Wardlaw evidently denies the possibility of discovering, in the constitution of the human mind, a foundation for a sound system of Ethics. He supports his denial still more strongly in the following words:—"According to Bishop Butler's theory, human nature is '*adapted to virtue*' as evidently as '*a watch is adapted to measure time*.' But suppose the watch, by the perverse interference of some lover of mischief, to have been so thoroughly disorganised,—its moving and its subordinate parts and power so changed in their collocation and their mutual action, that the result has become a constant tendency to go backward instead of forward, or to go backwards and forwards with irregular, fitful, and ever-shifting alternation, so as to require a complete remodelling, and especially a readjustment of its great moving power, to render it fit for its original purpose;—would not this be a more appropriate analogy for representing the present character of fallen man? The whole machine is out of order. The mainspring has been broken: and an antagonist power works all the parts of the mechanism. It is far from being with human nature, as Butler, by the similitude of the watch, might lead his readers to suppose. The watch, when duly adjusted, is only, in his phrase, '*liable to be out of order*.' This might suit for an illustration of the state of human nature *at first*, when it received its constitution from its Maker. But it has lost its appropriateness *now*. That nature, alas! is not now a machine that is merely '*apt to go out of order*';—it *is* out of order; so radically disorganised, that the grand original power which impelled all its movements has been broken and lost, and an unnatural power, the very opposite of it, has taken its place; so that it cannot be restored to the original harmony of its working, except by the interposition of the omnipotence that framed it." (P. 126.)

The ideas here expressed by Dr Wardlaw are entertained, with fewer or more modifications, by large classes of highly respectable men, belonging to different religious denominations.

How, then, amidst all this conflict of opinion as to the foundation, and even possibility of the existence, of moral science, is any approach to certainty to be attained?

I have announced that this course of Lectures will be founded on Phrenology. I intend it for those hearers who have paid some attention to this science;—who have seen reasonable evidence that the brain consists of a congeries of organs,—that each organ manifests a particular mental faculty,—and that, other conditions being equal, the power of manifesting each faculty bears a proportion to the size of its organs. To those individuals who have not seen sufficient evidence of the truth of these positions, I fear that I have little that can be satisfactory to offer. To them, I shall appear to stand in a condition of helplessness equal to that of all my predecessors whose conflicting opinions I have cited. These eminent men have drawn their conclusions, each from his individual consciousness, or from observing human actions, without having the means of arriving at a knowledge of the fundamental faculties of the mind itself. They have, as it were,

seen men commit gluttony and drunkenness; and, in ignorance of the functions of the stomach, have set down these vices as original tendencies of human nature, instead of viewing them as abuses merely of an indispensable appetite. Without Phrenology I should find no resting-place for the soles of my feet; and I at once declare, that, without its aid, I should as soon have attempted to discover the perpetual motion, as to throw any light, by the aid of reason alone, on the foundation of moral science. The ground of this opinion I have stated in the preface. Unless we are agreed concerning what the natural constitutions of the body and of the mind are, we have no means of judging of the duties which these constitutions prescribe. Once for all, therefore, I beg permission to assume the great principles and leading doctrines of Phrenology to be true; and I shall now proceed to shew you in what manner I apply them to unravel the Gordian knot of Ethics, which at present appears so straitly drawn and so deeply entangled. I do not despair of revealing to your understandings principles and relations resembling, in their order, beauty, and wisdom, the works of the Deity in other departments of nature.

First, then, in regard to the possibility of moral philosophy existing as a natural science. Dr Wardlaw speaks of the human mind as of a watch that has the tendency to go backwards, or fitfully backwards and forwards; as having its mainspring broken; and as having all the parts of the mechanism worked by an antagonist power. This description might appear to be sound to persons who, without great analytic powers of mind, resorted to no standard except the dark pages of history, in which to test its truth: but the Phrenologist appeals at once to the organs of the mind. Assuming that the brain is a congeries of mental organs, I ask, Who formed it? Who endowed it with its functions? Only one answer can be given.—It was God. When, therefore, we study the mental organs and their functions, we go directly to the fountain-head of true knowledge regarding the natural qualities of the human mind. Whatever we shall ascertain to be written in them, is doctrine imprinted by the finger of God himself. If we are certain that these organs were constituted by the Creator, we may rest assured that they have all a legitimate sphere of action. Our first step is to discover this sphere, and to draw a broad line of distinction between it and the sphere of their abuses; and here the superiority of our method over that of philosophers who studied only their own consciousness and the actions of men becomes apparent. They confounded abuses with uses; and because man is liable to abuse his faculties, they drew the conclusion, prematurely and unwarrantably, that his whole nature is in itself evil. Individual men may err in attempting to discover the functions and legitimate spheres of action of the mental organs, and may dispute about the conclusions thence to be drawn; but this imputes no spuriousness to the organs themselves, and casts no suspicion on the principle that they *must* have legitimate modes of *manifestation*. There they stand; and they are as undoubtedly the workmanship of the Creator, as the sun, the planets, or the entire universe itself. Error may be corrected by more accurate observations; and whenever we interpret their constitution aright, we shall assuredly be in possession of divine truth.

Dr Wardlaw might as reasonably urge the disorder of human nature as an argument against the possibility of studying the science of optics, as against that of cultivating ethical philosophy. Optics is founded on the structure, functions, and relations of the eye; and ethics on the structure, functions, and relations of the mental organs. Against op-

ties he might argue thus:—"The eye is no longer such as it was when it proceeded from the hands of the Creator; it is now liable to blindness; or if, in some more favoured individuals, the disorder of its condition does not proceed so far as to produce this dire effect, yet universal experience proves that human nature now labours under opaque eyes, squinting eyes, long-sighted eyes, and short-sighted eyes; and that many individuals have only one eye. The external world also is no longer what it originally was. There are mists which obscure the rays of light, clouds which intercept them, air and water which refract them; and almost every object in creation reflects them. Look at a straight rod half plunged into water, and you will see it crooked. Can a science founded on such organs, which operate in such a medium, and are related to such objects, be admitted into the class of ascertained truths, by which men are to regulate their conduct?" He might continue, "Astronomy, with all its pompous revelations of countless suns, attended by innumerable worlds rolling through space, must also be laid in the dust, and become a fallen monument of human pride and mental delusion. It is the offspring of this spurious science of optics. It pretends to record discoveries effected in infinite space by means of these perverted human eyes, acting through the dense and refracting damps of midnight air. Away with such gross impositions on the human understanding! Away with all human science, falsely so called!"

There would be as much truth in an argument like this, as in that urged by Dr Wardlaw against moral philosophy, founded on the study of nature. The answer to these objections against optics as a science, is, that the constitution, functions, and relations of the eye have been appointed by the Creator; that, although some unsound eyes exist, yet we have received judgment to enable us to discriminate between sound eyes and diseased or imperfect eyes. Again, we admit that mists occasionally present themselves; but we ascertain the laws of light by observations made at times when these are absent. Certain media also unquestionably refract the luminous rays; but they do so regularly, and their effects can be ascertained and allowed for. When, therefore, we observe objects by means of sound eyes, and use them in the most favourable circumstances, the knowledge which we derive from them is worthy of our acceptance as truth.

The parallel holds good in regard to the mind, to a much greater extent than many persons probably imagine. The Creator has fashioned all the organs of the human mind, determined their functions, and appointed their relations. We meet with some individuals, in whom the organs of the selfish propensities are too large, and the moral organs deficient: these are the morally blind. We see individuals who, with moderate organs of the propensities, have received large organs of Benevolence and Veneration, but deficient organs of Conscientiousness: these have a moral squint. But we meet also with innumerable persons in whom the organs of the propensities are moderate, and the moral and intellectual organs well developed; who thereby enjoy the natural elements of a sound moral vision; and who need only culture and information to lead them to moral truths, as sound, certain, and applicable to practice, as the conclusions of the optician himself.

Revelation necessarily presupposes a capacity in those to whom it is addressed of comprehending and judging of its communications; and Dr Wardlaw's argument appears to me to deny man's natural capacity to understand and interpret either Scripture or the works and institutions of the Creator. He discards natural ethics entirely, and insists that Scripture is our only guide in morals. Archbishop

Whately, on the other hand, who is not less eminent as a theologian, and certainly more distinguished as a philosopher, than Dr Wardlaw, assures us that "God has not revealed to us a system of morality such as would have been needed for a being who had no other means of distinguishing right and wrong. On the contrary, the inculcation of virtue and reprobation of vice in Scripture, are in such a tone as seem to presuppose a natural power, or a capacity for acquiring the power, to distinguish them. And if a man, denying or renouncing all claims of natural conscience, should practise, without scruple, everything he did not find expressly forbidden in Scripture, and think himself not bound to do anything that is not there expressly enjoined, exclaiming at every turn—

"Is it so nominated in the bond?"

he would be leading a life very unlike what a Christian's should be."

In my humble opinion, it is only an erroneous view of human nature, on the one side or the other, that can lead to such contradictory opinions as these. Archbishop Whately's view appears to me correct.

By observing the organs of the mind, then, and the mental powers connected with them, phrenologists perceive that three great classes of faculties have been bestowed on man.

1. Annual Propensities.
2. Moral Sentiments.
3. Intellectual Faculties.

Considering these in detail, as I have done in my previous courses, and in my System of Phrenology, and as I now assume that all of you have done, we do not find one of them that man has made, or could have made, himself. Man can create nothing. Can we fashion for ourselves a new sense, or add a new organ, a third eye for instance, to those we already possess? Impossible. All those organs, therefore, are the gifts of the Creator; and in speaking of them as such, I am bound to treat them with the same reverence that should be paid to any of his other works. Where, then, I ask, do we, in contemplating the organs, find the evidence of the mainspring being broken? Where do we find the antagonist power, which works all the mechanism contrary to the original design? Has it an organ? I cannot answer these questions: I am unable to discover either the broken mainspring, or an organ for the antagonist power. I see and feel—as who does not?—the crimes, the errors, and miseries of human beings, to which Dr Wardlaw refers as proofs of the disorder of which he speaks; but Phrenology gives a widely different account of their origin. We observe, for example, that individual men commit murder or blasphemy, and we all acknowledge that this is in opposition to virtue; but we do not find an organ of murder, or an organ whose office it is to antagonize all the moral faculties, and to commit blasphemy. We perceive that men are guilty of gluttony and drunkenness; but we nowhere find organs instituted whose function is to commit these immoralities. All that we discover is, that man has been created an organized being; that, as such, he needs food for nourishment; that, in conformity with this constitution, he has received a stomach calculated to digest the flesh of animals and to convert it into aliment; and that he sometimes abuses the functions of the stomach: and when he does so, we call this abuse gluttony and drunkenness. We observe farther, that in aid of his stomach he has received carnivorous teeth; and, in order to complete the system of arrangements, he has received a propensity having a specific organ, prompting him to kill animals that he may eat them. In accordance with these endowments, animals to be killed and

eaten are presented to him in abundance by the Creator. A man may abuse this propensity and kill animals for the pleasure of putting them to death—this is cruelty; or he may go a step farther—he may wantonly, under the instigation of the same propensity, kill his fellow-men—and this is murder. But this is a widely different view of human nature from that which supposes it to be endowed with positively vicious and perverse propensities—with machinery having a tendency only to go backwards, or to go alternately and fitfully backwards and forwards. Those individuals, then, who condemn murder, abuse their faculty of Destructiveness by directing it against their fellow-men. We have evidence of this fact: The organ is found large in those who have a tendency so to abuse it, and in them, in general, the moral organs are deficient.

Again, it is unquestionable that men steal, cheat, lie, blaspheme, and commit many other crimes; but we in vain look in the brain for organs destined to perpetrate these offences, or for an organ of a power antagonist to virtue, and whose proper office is to commit crimes in general. We discover organs of Acquisitiveness, which have legitimate objects, but which, being abused, lead to theft; organs of Secretiveness, which have a highly useful sphere of activity, but which, in like manner, when abused, lead to falsehood and deceit; and so with other organs.

These organs, I repeat, are the direct gifts of the Creator; and if the mere fact of their existence be not sufficient evidence of this proposition, we may find overwhelming proof in its favour by studying their relations to external nature. Those who deny that the human mind is constitutionally the same now as it was when it emanated from the hand of the Creator, generally admit that external nature at least is the direct workmanship of the Deity. They do not say that man, in corrupting his own dispositions, altered the whole fabric of the universe—that he infused into animals new instincts, or imposed on the vegetable kingdom a new constitution, and different laws. They admit that God created all these such as they exist. Now, in surveying vegetable organization, we perceive production from an embryo,—sustenance by food,—growth, maturity, decay, and death,—woven into the very fabric of their existence. In surveying the animal creation, we discover the same phenomena, and the same results: and on turning to ourselves, we find that we too are organized, that we assimilate food, that we grow, that we attain maturity, and that our bodies die. Here, then, there is an institution by the Creator, of great systems (vegetable and animal) of production, growth, decay, and death. It will not be doubted that these institutions owe their existence to the divine will.

If it be asserted that men's delinquencies offended the Deity, and brought his wrath on the offenders; and that the present constitution of the world is the consequence of that displeasure; philosophy offers no answer to this proposition. She does not inquire into the motives which induced the Creator to constitute the world, physical and mental, such as we see it; but, in pointing to the existence and constitution of vegetables, of animals, and of man, she respectfully maintains that all these God *did* constitute, and endow with their properties and relationships; and that in studying them we are investigating his genuine workmanship.

Now, if we find on the one hand a system of decay and death in external nature, animate and inanimate, we find also in man a faculty of Destructiveness which is pleased with destruction, and which places him in harmony with the order of creation:—if we find on the one hand an external world, in

which there exist—fire calculated to destroy life by burning, water by drowning, and cold by freezing,—ponderous and moving bodies capable of injuring us by blows, and a great power of gravitation exposing us to danger by falling; we discover, also, in surveying our own mental constitution, a faculty of Cautiousness, whose office it is to prompt us to take care, and to avoid these sources of danger. In other words, we see an external economy admirably adapted to our internal economy; and hence we receive an irresistible conviction that the one of these arrangements has been designedly framed in relation to the other. External destruction is related to our internal faculty of Destructiveness; external danger to our internal faculty of Cautiousness.

I have frequently remarked that one of the most striking proofs of the existence of a Deity, appears to me to be obtained by surveying the roots of a tree, and its relationship to the earth. These are admirably adapted; and my argument is this:—The earth is a body which knows neither its own existence nor the existence of the tree: the tree, also, knows neither its own qualities nor those of the earth. Yet the adaptation of the one to the other is a real and useful relation, which we, as intelligent beings, see and comprehend. That adaptation could not exist, unless a mind had conceived, executed, and established it; the mind that did so is not of this world; therefore, a Deity, who is that mind, exists, and every time we look on this adaptation, we see His power and wisdom directly revealed to us. The same argument applies, and with equal force, to the mental faculties and external nature. We see natural objects, threatening us with danger, and we find in ourselves a faculty prompting us to take care of our own safety. This adaptation is assuredly divine; but you will observe that if the adaptation be divine, the things adapted must also be divine: the external world threatening danger must have been deliberately constituted such as it is; and the human mind must have been deliberately constituted such as it is; otherwise this adaptation could not exist.

Again, we find that the human body needs both food and raiment, and on surveying the external world we discover that in a great portion of the earth there are winter's barren frosts and snows. But in examining the human mind, we find a faculty of Constructiveness, prompting and enabling us to fabricate clothing; and Acquisitiveness, prompting us to acquire and store up articles fitted for our sustenance and accommodation, so as to place us in comfort when the chill winds blow and the ground yields us no support. We discover also, that nature presents us with numberless raw materials, fitted to be worked up, by means of our faculties, into the very commodities of which our bodies stand in need. All these gifts and arrangements, I repeat, are assuredly of divine institution; and although individual men, by abusing the faculty of Constructiveness, often-times commit forgeries, pick locks, and perpetrate other crimes; and, by abusing Acquisitiveness, steal, this does not prove that these faculties are in themselves evil.

There is a wide difference, then, between Dr Wardlaw's views and mine, in regard to human nature. His broken mainspring and antagonist power are nowhere to be met with in all the records of real philosophy; while the crimes which he ascribes to them are accounted for by abuses of organs clearly instituted by the Creator, having legitimate spheres of action, and wisely adapted to a world obviously arranged by Him in relation to them.

Dr Wardlaw appears to have studied human nature chiefly in the actions of men, and he has not distinguished between the faculties bestowed by the

Creator and the abuses of them, for which individual delinquents alone are answerable.

If these views be well founded, moral philosophy, as a scientific study, becomes not only possible, but exceeding interesting and profitable. Its objects are evidently to trace the nature and legitimate sphere of action of all our bodily functions and mental faculties, and their relations to the external world, with the conviction that to use them properly is virtue, to abuse them is vice. These principles, also, if sound, will enable us to account for the barren condition of moral philosophy as a science.

The numerous errors, the confusion and contradiction of previous moralists, are to be ascribed to their having no adequate physiological knowledge of the structure and functions of the body, and no stable philosophy of mind. In particular, they possessed no knowledge of the mental organs, and no sufficient means of discriminating between what is natural and what incidental in human conduct. Sir James Mackintosh remarks, that "there must be primary pleasures, pains, and even appetites, which arise from no prior state of mind, and which, if explained at all, can be derived only from *bodily organization*; for," says he, "if there were not, there could be no *secondary* desires. What the number of the underived principles may be, is a question to which the answers of philosophers have been extremely various, and of which the consideration is not necessary to our present purpose. The rules of philosophizing, however, require that causes should not be multiplied without necessity."

With all deference to Sir James Mackintosh's authority, I conceive that the determination of "the number of the underived principles" of mind, is the first step in all sound mental science, and especially in ethics; and when he admits that these "can be derived only from *bodily organization*," it is unphilosophical in him to add, "that the rules of philosophizing require that causes (faculties?) should not be multiplied without necessity." Who would think of attempting either to multiply or diminish senses, feelings, or intellectual powers depending on "bodily organization," unless he could multiply and diminish, make and unmake, corresponding bodily organs at the same time?

In my System of Phrenology I have presented you with a view of the underived faculties of mind, connected with specific organs, in so far as these have been ascertained; I have endeavoured to point out the sphere of action of each, and to explain the effects of size in the organs on the power of manifesting the faculties. These points being assumed, an intelligible foundation is laid for ethical science. Begging in mind the three great divisions of the human faculties into Animal Propensities, Moral Sentiments, and Intellectual Powers, let us attend to Bishop Butler's exposition of the groundwork of moral philosophy.

Bishop Butler, in the preface to his Sermons, says, "It is from considering the relations which the several appetites and passions in the inward frame have to each other, and, above all, the supremacy of reflection, or conscience, that we get the idea of the system or constitution of human nature. And from the idea itself it will as fully appear, that this our nature, *i. e.* constitution, is adapted to virtue, as from the idea of a watch it appears that its nature, *i. e.* constitution or system, is adapted to measure time.

"Mankind has various instincts and principles of action, as brute creatures have; some leading most directly and immediately to the good of the community, and some most directly to private good.

"Man has several which brutes have not; particularly reflection or conscience, an approbation of some principles or actions and disapprobation of others.

"Brutes obey their instincts or principles of action according to certain rules; suppose the constitution of their body, and the objects around them.

"The generality of mankind also obey their instincts and principles, one and all of them; those propensities we call good, as well as the bad, according to the same rules, namely, the constitution of body, and the external circumstances which they are in.

"Brutes, in acting according to the rules before mentioned, their bodily constitution and circumstances, act suitably to *their whole nature*.

"Mankind also, in acting thus, would act suitably to their whole nature, if no more were to be said of man's nature than what has been now said; if that, as it is a true, were also a complete, adequate account of our nature.

"But that is not a complete account of man's nature. Somewhat further must be brought in to give us an adequate notion of it; namely, *that one of those principles of action, conscience, or reflection, compared with the rest, as they all stand together in the nature of man, plainly bears upon it marks of authority over all the rest, and claims the absolute direction of them all, to allow or forbid their gratification; a disapprobation of reflection being in itself a principle manifestly superior to a mere propensity. And the conclusion is, that to allow no more to this superior principle or part of our nature, than to other parts; to let it govern and guide only occasionally in common with the rest, as its turn happens to come, from the temper and circumstances one happens to be in; this is not to act conformably to the constitution of man: neither can any human creature be said to act conformably to his constitution of nature, unless he allows to that superior principle the absolute authority which is due to it.*"—(Butler's Works, vol. ii. Preface.)

I agree with Butler in thinking, that, in cases of conflict between our various desires, certain of our faculties are intended to rule and others to obey; and that the belief that it is so is intuitive in well-constituted minds.

According to Phrenology, the human faculties consist of animal propensities, moral sentiments, and intellectual powers. Each of these has a legitimate sphere of action, but each is also liable to abuse. That rule of action is virtuous or right which is in harmony with them all, each performing its proper office. But occasionally conflicting desires and emotions arise in the mind: a man, for example, may desire to acquire his neighbour's property without compensation, or to do him an injury, in gratification of the feeling of revenge; these impulses proceed from Acquisitiveness, Destructiveness, and Self-Esteem, in a state of vivid excitement. But if the organs of the moral and intellectual faculties be largely developed, and enlightened by knowledge, the individual will experience counter emotions rising in his mind, inconsistent with these desires, disapproving of them, and denouncing them as wrong. Which class of faculties, in such instances, is entitled to rule? I answer, that the moral and intellectual powers are superior in kind to the animal propensities, and that every well-constituted mind *feels* that, in cases of conflict, they are entitled to restrain the inferior desires. This is the sense in which I speak of the supremacy of the moral sentiments and intellect.

Although the moral and intellectual faculties are by nature superior in kind to the animal propensities, they need the assistance of these inferior powers in judging of what is right. For example, a mother, if extremely deficient in Philoprogenitiveness, could not arrive, by means of the moral and intellectual faculties alone, at the same sound and effective perceptions of duty towards her children, which she

could reach if she possessed an ample development of that organ acting in harmonious combination with the moral and intellectual powers.

In applying these principles to our present subject, I observe that the organ of Philoprogenitiveness, for example, exists, and that its function is to produce the love of children. This affection in itself is good, but when manifested in action it may produce a variety of effects. It may prompt us to gratify every desire of the child, however fantastic, if the indulgence will give it pleasure for a moment; but when the intellect is employed to trace the consequences of this gratification, and sees that it is injurious to the health, the temper, the moral dispositions, and the general happiness of the infant, then Benevolence disapproves of that mode of treatment, because it leads to suffering, which Benevolence dislikes; Conscientiousness disapproves of it, because it is unjust to the child to misdirect its inclinations through ignorant fondness; and Veneration is offended by it, because our duty to God requires that we should improve all his gifts to the best advantage, and not prepare an infant for crime and misery, by cultivating habits of reckless self-indulgence, regardless of all ultimate results. If, in any individual mother, Philoprogenitiveness exist very large, in combination with weak organs of the moral sentiments and intellect, she may abuse this beautiful instinct, by pampering and spoiling her children; but it is an error to charge the conduct of an ill-constituted, and perhaps an ill-informed individual mind, against human nature in general, as if all its faculties were so perverted that they could manifest themselves only in abuses. My object will be to expound the courses of action to which we are prompted by all our faculties when acting in harmonious combination; and I shall admit all actions to be virtuous or right which are approved of by these combined powers, and treat all as vicious or wrong which are disapproved by them; and my doctrine is, that *it is according to the dictates of all the faculties enlightened by knowledge, harmoniously combined, which constitutes certain actions virtuous, and discordance with them which constitutes other actions vicious.*

We are now able to understand the origin of the various theories of the foundation of virtue to which I alluded at the commencement of this lecture, and which have been the themes of so much discussion among philosophers. Most of the authors whom I have quoted recognise one of these three great foundations of virtue: According to them, 1st, All actions are virtuous which tend to promote the happiness of sentient and intelligent beings, and they are virtuous because they possess this tendency; 2dly, All actions are virtuous which are conformable to the will of God, and they are so for this reason, and no other; 3dly, All actions are virtuous which are in conformity with the dictates of our moral sense or moral faculty, which conformity is the sole characteristic of virtue. The partizans of each of these foundations of virtue have denied the reality or sufficiency of the other foundations. These differences of opinion may be thus accounted for.

The sentiment of Benevolence desires universal happiness, or the general good of all beings. When we wantonly sacrifice the happiness of any being, it is pained, and produces uneasy emotions in our minds. Those philosophers who place the foundation of virtue in the tendency of the action judged of, to produce happiness, are right in so far, because this is one foundation; but they are wrong in so far as they teach that it is the only foundation of virtue.

In like manner the organ of Veneration desires to yield obedience to the will of God, and it experiences painful emotions when we knowingly contravene its dictates. Those philosophers who place the essence

of virtue in obedience to the will of God, are sound in their judgment, in so far as this is one essential foundation of virtue; but they err in so far as they represent it to be the only one.

And, thirdly, Conscientiousness produces the feelings of duty, obligation, and incumbency. It desires to do justice in all things. It enforces the dictates of our other moral faculties. Benevolence, for instance, from its own constitution, desires to communicate happiness, and Conscientiousness enforces its dictates by proclaiming that it is our duty to act in conformity with them. It causes us to feel that we are guilty or criminal if we wantonly destroy or impair the enjoyment of any being. It enforces also the aspirations of Veneration, and tells us that we are guilty if we disobey the will of God. Further, its own special function is to enforce justice, when our own rights and feelings, and those of other men, come into competition. Those philosophers who founded virtue in a moral sense, were right in so far as this faculty is one most important foundation of virtue; but it is not the only one.

Each of the moral sentiments produces the feeling of right and wrong in its own sphere; Benevolence proclaims cruelty to be wrong, and Veneration condemns profanity: But each is liable to err when it acts singly. There are men, for example, in whom Benevolence is very strong, and Conscientiousness very weak, and who, following the dictates of the former, without reference to those of the latter sentiment, often perpetrate great wrongs by indulging in an extravagant generosity at the expense of others. They are generous before they are just. Charles Surface, in the *School for Scandal*, is the personification of such a character. Veneration acting singly is liable to sanction superstitious observances; or acting in combination with Destructiveness, without Benevolence and Conscientiousness, it may approve of cruel persecution for the sake of preserving the purity of the faith which it has embraced. Farther, as each of the inferior propensities has a legitimate sphere of action, it has legitimate demands, and the moral and intellectual faculties must give due effect to these, before their decisions can be regarded as just and right. For these reasons, I consider the virtue of an action to consist in its being in harmony with the dictates of *all the faculties acting in harmonious combination, and duly enlightened.*

The moral faculties often do act singly, and while they keep within the limits of their virtuous sphere, the dictates of all of them harmonize. We have a similar example in music. Melody and time both enter into the constitution of music, but we may have time without melody, as in beating a drum; or melody without time, as in the sounds of an *Æolian* harp. But the two faculties which take cognizance of melody and time are constituted so as to be capable of acting in harmony, when they are both applied to the same object. So it is in regard to the moral sentiments. If a man fall into the sea, another individual, having a large organ of Benevolence, and who can swim, may be prompted, by the instinctive impulse of benevolence, instantly to leap into the water and save him, without, in the least, thinking of the will of God, or the obligations of duty. But when we calmly contemplate the action, we perceive it to be one falling within the legitimate sphere of Benevolence. It is approved of by enlightened intellect, and is also conformable at once to the divine will, and to the dictates of Conscientiousness. In like manner, every action that is truly conformable to the will of God, or agreeable to Veneration, when acting within its proper sphere, will be found just and beneficial in its consequences, or in harmony also with Conscientiousness and Be-

nevolence. And every just and right action will be discovered to be beneficial in its consequences, and also in harmony with the will of God. It will be discovered also to be in harmony with the legitimate demands of all the propensities.

There is a distinction between *virtue* and *merit*, which it is important to understand. *Virtue*, as I have said, consists in actions in harmony with all our faculties; *merit*, in actions performed in obedience to the dictates of the moral sentiments and enlightened intellect, in *opposition* to the solicitations of the propensities. This distinction is ably elucidated by a writer in the *Phrenological Journal*. "The idea of *merit*," says he, "emanates solely from the operation of the selfish feelings and desires." "It is evident that Conscientiousness can see no *merit* in being just, for inclination can never perceive merit in its own gratification. In the same way, Veneration can discover no *merit* in yielding that deferential homage to superiority, which is its natural tribute. And Benevolence is equally blind to the perception of merit, in being kind and charitable. Yet merit is a word which, in reference to justice, veneration, and charity, conveys a distinct idea, and we are bound, therefore, to account for its existence." "When we contemplate the noble Regulus eloquently pleading for the very decree which must consign him to the fury of his enemies," "it is in virtue neither of Conscientiousness nor Veneration that his great merit is perceived, because these faculties discover nothing in the action beyond the simple obedience to their own dictates. But Cautiousness, with its dark forebodings of pain, and misery, and death; and Adhesiveness, with its yearning after the objects of its fond desire, tell us of the terrible assaults which Conscientiousness and Veneration must have sustained in maintaining their supremacy. And the different degrees of merit which different minds will discover in this action, will be in exact proportion to the vigour in these minds of the two higher sentiments which produced the action in relation to the power of the two selfish feelings by which it would have been opposed." "The clamorous outcries of these selfish feelings tell us of the snares with which Conscientiousness and Veneration were, in this instance, environed, and it is, therefore, we attach *merit* to the supremacy they maintained."—*Phren. Journ.* No. XII.

When one of these faculties acts independently of the other, it does not necessarily err, but it is more liable to do so than when all operate in concert. This is the reason that any theory of morals, founded on only one of them, is generally imperfect or unsound.

The idea of resolving morality into intellectual perceptions of utility, into obedience to the will of God, or into any other single principle, has arisen, probably, from the organ of the mental faculty, on which that one principle depends, having been largest in the brain of the author of the theory, in consequence of which he felt most strongly the particular emotion which he selected as its foundation. Those individuals again, who deny that there is any *natural* basis for moral science, and who regard the Bible as the only foundation of moral and religious duty, are generally deficient in the organs either of Conscientiousness or Benevolence, or of both; and because they feebly experience the dictates of a natural conscience, they draw the inference that the same holds good with all mankind.

Another question remains—What means do we possess for discovering the *qualities of actions*, so that our whole faculties may give emotions of approval or disapproval upon sound data? For example—Veneration disposes us to obey the will of God, but how shall we discover what the will of God is? It is the office of the intellect to make this discovery.

For instance—A young lady from England had been taught from her infancy that God had commanded her to keep Good Friday holy, and sacred to religious duties. When she came to Scotland for the first time, and saw no sanctity attached to that day, her Veneration was disagreeably affected; and if she also had treated the day with indifference, her conscience would have upbraided her. In a few weeks afterwards, the half-yearly fast-day of the Church of Scotland came round, but in her mind no sanctity whatever was attached to it;—her intellect had never been informed that either God or the Church had appointed that day to be held sacred; she desired to follow her usual occupations, and was astonished at the rigid solemnity with which the day was observed by the Scotch. Here the English and Scotch intellect had obtained dissimilar information, and, in each case, Veneration acted according to its own lights.

The intellect must be employed, therefore, to discover the motives, relations, and consequences of the actions to be judged of, and the propensities and moral sentiments will give emotions of approval or disapproval, according to the aspects presented to them. In many ordinary cases no difficulty in judging occurs; for instance, the mere perception of a fellow-creature struggling in the water, is sufficient to rouse Benevolence, and to inspire us with the desire to save him. But when the question is put, Is an hospital for foundling children benevolent?—if we look only at one result (saving the lives of individual children), and listen to Philoprogenitiveness exclusively, we should say that it is; but if the intellect observes *all* the consequences;—for instance, first, the temptation to vice afforded by provision being made for illegitimate children;—secondly, the mortality of the infants, which is enormous, from their being withdrawn from maternal care and entrusted to mere hireling keepers;—thirdly, the isolation of the children so reared from all kindred relationship with the rest of the race;—and, fourthly, the expense which is thrown away in this very questionable arrangement: I say, after the intellect has discovered and contemplated all these facts and results, neither Philoprogenitiveness nor the moral sentiments would be gratified with foundling hospitals, but both would desire to apply the public funds to more purely beneficent institutions. Without intellect, therefore, the propensities and sentiments have not knowledge; and without propensities and moral sentiments, the intellect sees merely facts and results, and is destitute of feeling. The harmonious action of the whole gives the rule of virtue.

Phrenology shows that different individuals possess the mental organs in different degrees: I do not mean, therefore, to say that, whatever the proportions of these may be in each individual, the dictates of his animal, moral, and intellectual powers, acting in harmonious combination, are rules of conduct not to be disputed. On the contrary, in most individuals one or several of the organs are so deficient, or so excessive, in size, in proportion to the others, that their perceptions of duty will differ from the highest standards. The dictates of the animal, moral, and intellectual powers, therefore, acting in harmonious combination, which constitute rules of conduct, are the collective dictates of the best endowed and best balanced minds, illuminated by the greatest knowledge.

If, then, this theory of our moral constitution be well founded, it explains the darkness and confusion of the opinions entertained by previous philosophers on the subject.

Dr Wardlaw's antagonist power is merely single faculties, or particular groups of them, acting with undue energy, and breaking the bounds prescribed

to them by the rest. They will be most liable to do this in those individuals in whom the organs are most unequally combined; but there is no organ or faculty in itself immoral, or necessarily opposed to the harmonious action of the whole, as Dr Wardlaw seems to suppose.

To be able, then, to discover what courses of action are in harmony with all our powers, we must use our intellectual faculties in examining nature. Believing that both man and the external world are the workmanship of the Creator, I propose, in the following Lectures, to consider—

1st, The constitution of man as an *individual*; and to endeavour to discover what duties are prescribed to him by its qualities and objects.

2dly, I shall consider man as a *domestic being*, and endeavour to discover the duties prescribed to him by his constitution, as a husband, a father, and a child.

3dly, I shall consider man as a *social being*, and discuss the duties arising from his social qualities. This will involve the principles of government and political economy.

4thly, I shall consider man as a *religious being*, and discuss the duties which he owes to God, so far as these are discoverable from the light of nature.

LECTURE II.

ON THE SANCTIONS BY WHICH THE NATURAL LAWS OF MORALITY ARE SUPPORTED.

Every law supposes a Lawgiver, and punishment annexed to transgression. God prescribes certain actions by the constitution of nature, and He is therefore the Lawgiver—He supports his laws by rewards and punishments—Does he do so by special acts of Providence? Or are his rewards and punishments certain consequences of good or evil, appointed by Him to follow from our actions? It is important to shew that God dispenses justice in this world, because we know no other; and if He be not just here, there is no natural and logical ground for inferring that he will be just in any other world—Evidence that he does dispense justice here—His supposed injustice is apparent only—Philosophers have not understood the principles of His government—The independent action of the several natural laws is the key to it—If we obey the physical laws, they reward us with physical advantages—If we obey the organic laws, they reward us with health—If we obey the moral laws, they reward us with mental joy—If we disobey any one of those laws, we are punished under it, although we observe all the others—There is more order and justice in the Divine government in this world than is generally recognised.

In my last Lecture, I endeavoured to point out the foundation on which Moral Philosophy, inferred from the constitution of nature, rests. The mental organs and faculties being the gift of God, each has a legitimate sphere of activity, though liable to be abused; and the rule for discriminating between uses and abuses is, that every act is morally *right* which is approved of by the whole faculties duly enlightened and acting harmoniously; while all actions disapproved of by the faculties thus acting are *wrong*. In all harmonious actions, the moral sentiments and intellect, being superior in kind, direct the propensities. In cases of conflict, the propensities must yield. Such is the *internal* guide to morality with which man has been furnished.

The next inquiry is, Whether the judgments of our faculties, when acting harmoniously, are supported by any *external* authority in nature? Every law supposes a lawgiver, and punishment annexed to transgression. Certain courses of action being prescribed and forbidden by the constitutions of external

nature and of our own faculties, God, who made these and their organs, is consequently the Lawgiver; but the question remains—Has he used any means to give sanction, *in this world*, to his commands revealed to us in nature? All are agreed that rewards and punishments have been established by God; but as to the *extent, manner, and time*, of dispensing with them, very different opinions are entertained. By some, it is conceived that God, like the human magistrate, watches the infringement of his laws in each particular instance, and applies punishment accordingly; but that neither his punishments nor his rewards are the *natural* effects of the conduct to which they have reference. Such is the view of the ways of Providence embodied in Parnell's "Hermit;" and many of us may recollect the pleasure with which, in youth, we perused that representation, and the regret we felt, that experience did not support its beautiful theory. A servant is described as having been thrown over a bridge by his companion, and drowned; which event at first shocks our Benevolence; but we are then told that the sufferer intended that evening to murder a kind and indulgent master, and that his companion was an angel sent by God to prevent, and also to punish him for his intended crime. Another scene represents an hospitable rich man's son dying apparently of convulsions; but we are told that the same angel suffocated him, to snatch him away from his parents, because their affections, doting too fondly on him, led them to forget their duty to heaven.

These representations, of course, are fictitious; but notions of a similar character may be traced existing in the minds of many serious persons, and constituting their theory of the divine government of the world. The grand feature of this system is, that the punishment does not follow from the offence, by any natural bond of connection, but is administered separately and directly by a special interposition of Providence. The servant's wicked design had no natural connection with his falling over the bridge; and the neglect of heaven, by the parents of the child, had no such natural relation to its physiological condition, that it should have died of convulsions in consequence of that sin. There are, as I have said, some religious persons who really entertain notions similar to these; who believe that God, by special acts of providence, or particular manifestations of His power, rewards and punishes men's actions in a manner not connected with their offences by any natural link of cause and effect; or, at least, so remotely connected that the link is not discernible by human sagacity. They conceive that this view imparts to the divine government a sublime mysteriousness which renders it more imposing, solemn, and awful, and better calculated than any other to enforce obedience on men. To me it appears, on the contrary, to be ergoneous, and to be a fountain of superstition, at once derogatory to the dignity of the Divine Ruler, and injurious to the moral, intellectual, and religious character of His subjects. I shall, in a subsequent part of this lecture, state the reasons for this opinion.

Another notion entertained regarding the moral government of the world is, that God has revealed in the Scriptures every duty which He requires us to perform, and every action which He forbids us to do; that He leaves us at full liberty in this life, to obey or disobey these commands as we please; but that, in the world to come, He will call us to account, and punish us for our sins, or reward us for our obedience. There are strong objections to this theory also.—Religious persons will at once recognise that the instruction communicated to man in the Scriptures may be classed under two great heads. The first class embraces events that occurred before the existing state of nature commenced (such as the transac-

tions in Paradise before the fall), also events that transcend nature (such as the resurrection of Jesus Christ), and events that are destined to occur when nature shall be no more (such as the final judgment); together with certain duties (such as belief, or faith) which are founded on those communications. In regard to all of these, science and philosophy are silent. The second head has reference to the practical conduct which man is bound to pursue with regard to the beings in the present world. The first objection, then to the theory of the divine government last mentioned, is, that the Bible, however complete with respect to the former department of instruction, really does not contain a full exposition of man's secular duties.

In the last Lecture, I quoted a striking passage to this effect from Archbishop Whately. The Scriptures assume that man will use his moral and intellectual faculties to discover and perform the duties relative to this life imposed on him by the constitution of nature. It is very important to manage aright the physical, moral, and intellectual training of children; and yet the Bible contains no specific rules for discharging this duty. It tells us to train up a child in the way he should go, and that when he is old he will not depart from it; but it does not describe, with practical minuteness, *what that way is*. If it do so, every incompetent schoolmaster, and every ignorant mother who injures her children through lack of knowledge, must have sadly neglected the study of the Bible. But even the most pious and assiduous students of the Scriptures, differ widely among themselves in regard to the training of their children; so that the Bible must be either silent, or very obscure on this point. How many thousands of Christian parents neglect the physical education of their children altogether, and in consequence either lose them by death, or render them victims of disease! Again, each sect instructs its children in its own tenets, and calls this the way in which they should go; yet, when we observe the discord and animosity that prevail among these children when they become men and women; when we see the Protestants denouncing the Catholic as in error, the Catholic excommunicating the Protestant as a heretic, the Trinitarian designating the Unitarian as an infidel, and the Unitarian condemning the Trinitarian as superstitious; we have proof, certainly, that the children, when old, *do not* depart from the way in which they have been trained: but we likewise see, that it is impossible that *all* of them can have been trained in the *right* way, since otherwise there could not be such lamentable differences, and so much hostility between them. I can discover, therefore, in the Bible no such complete code of secular duties, as this system implies. In the "Constitution of Man," I have endeavoured to shew that God intended that we should employ our mental faculties in studying His works, and by this means to fill up the chapter of our secular duties, left incomplete in the Bible.

A second objection to the theory in question is this—it implies that God exercises very little temporal authority in the government of this world, reserving his punishments and rewards chiefly for a future life. One cause of this view seems to be, that most of the teachers of morals and religion have confined their attention to moral and religious duties, and often to their own peculiar and erroneous interpretation of them; instead of taking a comprehensive survey of human nature and of *all* the duties prescribed by its constitution. They have regarded life as monks do;—not practically. They observed that sometimes a man who believed and acted according to their notions of sound religion and sterling virtue, fell into worldly misfortune, lost his children prematurely by death, or was himself afflicted with bad

health; while other men, who believed and acted in opposition to their notions of right, flourished in *health and wealth*, and possessed a vigorous offspring; and they concluded that God has left the virtuous man to suffer here, for his probation, intending to reward him hereafter; and the wicked to prosper, with the view of aggravating his guilt and increasing the severity of his future punishment. They have rarely attempted to reconcile these apparent anomalies to reason, or to bring them within the scope of a just government on earth. It humbly appears to me that God does exercise a very striking and efficient jurisdiction over this world, and that it is chiefly through our own inattention to the manner in which he does so that we are blind to its existence and effects.

It is important to establish the reality and efficiency of the divine government in this world, because a plausible argument has been reared on the contrary doctrine, to the effect that there can be no reward and punishment *at all*, if none is administered in this life. The line of reasoning by which this view is supported is the following:—We can judge of God, it is said, only by his works. His works in this world are all that we are acquainted with. If, therefore, in this life, we find that virtue goes unrewarded, and that vice triumphs, the legitimate inference is that it will always be so. Bishop Butler, indeed, in his celebrated "Analogy," has argued, that *because* God has *not* executed complete justice here, he *must* intend to do so hereafter, for justice is one of his attributes; but Mr Robert Forsyth, in his work on Moral Science, has stated the objection to this argument in strong terms. "If," says he, "God has created a world in which justice is not accomplished, by what analogy, or on what grounds, do we infer that any other world of his creation will be free from this imperfection?" Butler would answer, "Because justice is an attribute of the Divine mind." The opponents, however, reply, "How do you know that it is so? We know the Deity only through His works; and if you concede that justice is not accomplished in the only world of which we have any experience, the legitimate inference is that justice is *not* one of His attributes: at least the inference that it is one of them is illogical." I have heard this last argument stated, although I have not seen it printed.

It will serve the cause of moral science to present a valid answer to these objections; and the most satisfactory to my mind would be one which should shew that the Divine Ruler actually does execute justice here, and that therefore we are entitled to infer that he will be just hereafter; and such, accordingly, is the argument which I respectfully propose to maintain.

The supposed anomalies in the Divine government are apparent only, and, when properly understood, form no exception to the Creator's attribute of justice. The key to them is the separate action of the different departments of our own constitution and of external nature, or the *independent operation of natural beings and substances*, each regulated by laws peculiar to itself. This doctrine is explained in the "Constitution of Man;" and I here introduce it as the basis of our future investigations. Viewing the world on this principle, we discover,

1st, That inorganic matter operates according to fixed laws, which are independent of the moral or religious character of those whom it affects. If six persons be travelling in a coach, and if it break down through insufficiency of the axle, or any similar cause, the travellers will be projected against external objects according to the impetus communicated to their bodies by the previous motion of the vehicle, exactly as if they had been inanimate substances of

the same texture and materials. Their vices or their virtues will not modify the physical influences that impel or resist them. The cause of the accident is simply physical imperfection in the vehicle, and not the displeasure of God against the individual men who occupy it, on account of their sins. If one break a leg, another an arm, a third his neck, and a fourth escape unhurt, the difference of result is to be ascribed solely to the differences of the mechanical action of the coach on their bodies, according to their differences of size, weight, and position, or to difference in the objects against which they are projected; one falling against a stone, and another perhaps alighting on turf.

The whole calamity in such a case is to be viewed simply as a punishment for neglecting to have a coach sufficiently strong; and it serves to render men who have the charge of coaches more attentive to their duty in future. The common sense of mankind has led them to recognise this principle in their laws; for, in most civilized countries, the proprietors of public conveyances are held answerable for damage occasioned by their insufficiency. It is recognised also in Scripture. "Think not," says Christ, "that those on whom the Tower of Siloam fell, were sinners above all Israel." In other words, the Tower of Siloam, like all other edifices, stood erect, in virtue of the law of gravitation, as long as its foundations were sound, and its superstructure firm; and it fell when one or other of these gave way, without reference to the qualities of the persons who were below it.

When a stage-coach is overturned, and a profligate person is saved, while a valuable Christian is killed, some individuals wonder at the inscrutable ways of Providence: but both bad and good men have received from nature organized bodies which need to be carefully protected from injury; and the real lesson taught by this calamity is, that no moral or religious qualities will preserve the body from injury if the laws which regulate the action of physical substances be not duly attended to. I have elsewhere remarked, that if good men could sail in safety in unsound ships, or travel in dilapidated carriages, upborne by unseen ministers of heaven, on account of their holiness, the world would lapse into confusion; and these good men themselves would soon find nothing provided for them, but the most deplorably crazy conveyances, into which sinners could not with safety set a foot.

The objection may naturally occur, that passengers have neither skill nor opportunity for judging of the soundness of ships and sufficiency of coaches, and that it is hard that they should suffer death and destruction from the carelessness or incapacity of others who let out these articles to hire, or employ them in the public service. I shall unfold the answer to this objection in a subsequent part of the course. It falls under the social law. We avail ourselves of the good qualities of our fellow-men, and we must suffer from their defects when, without due regard to their qualifications, we entrust our interests or safety to their care.

In so far, then, as pain, distress, and calamity, arise from the action of physical substances, they should be viewed merely as punishments for our not paying due attention to the laws by which the action of these substances is regulated. They forcibly tell us, that if we wish to live in safety, we must habitually exercise our understandings in accommodating our conduct to the agencies of the material objects around us. It seems irrational to expect that God will hereafter compensate good men for sufferings which they bring upon themselves by neglecting to study and obey His own institutions.

The next class of objects to which I solicit your

attention is the *organic*. These have received definite constitutions, and observe specific modes of action; in other words, they also act under fixed and independent laws, impressed on their constitution by nature. Thus, the human body is subject to continual waste, to repair which, nutriment is necessary. This is supplied through the medium of the blood; which replaces decayed particles carried off by the absorbent vessels, and stimulates the brain and other organs to perform their functions aright. But to render it capable of accomplishing these objects, it must be supplied with chyle from the stomach, and oxygen from the lungs; and hence a necessity arises for eating wholesome food and breathing pure air. The bones are composed of organized materials, and are supplied with certain vessels for their nutrition, and with others for the removal of their decayed particles: all of which act regularly, like the mechanism of a plant. Similar observations apply to the muscles, the skin, the blood-vessels, the brain, and all other portions of the body.

Growth and decay, health and disease, pleasure and pain, in all of these parts, take place according to fixed rules, which are impressed on the organs themselves; and the organs act invariably, independently, and immutably, according to these rules. For instance—if we neglect to take exercise, the circulation of the blood becomes languid, the bones, muscles, nerves, and brain, are imperfectly nourished; and the consequences are pain,—loss of appetite, of strength, of mental vivacity, and vigour,—and a general feeling of unhappiness. If we labour too intensely with our minds, we exhaust our brains, impair digestion, and destroy sleep; this renders the organs of the mind incapable of action; and we are visited at last with lassitude, imbecility, palsy, apoplexy or death. If we exercise our muscles too severely and too long, we expend an undue amount of the nervous energy of our bodies on them, our brains become incapable of thinking, and the nerves incapable of feeling, and dulness and stupidity seize on our mental powers.

It is, therefore, a *law* inscribed on the constitution of the body,—That we should consume a sufficiency of wholesome food, and breathe unvitiated air. And however moral our conduct,—however constant our attendance in the house of prayer,—however benevolent our actions may be,—yet, if we neglect this organic law, punishment will be inflicted. In like manner, if the laws of exercise be infringed,—if, for instance, we overwork the brain,—we are visited with punishment, whether the offence be committed in reclaiming the heathen, in healing the sick, in pursuing commerce, in gaming, or in ruling a state. If we overtask the brain at all, it becomes exhausted, and its action is enfeebled; and as the efficiency of the mind depends on its proper condition, the mental powers suffer a corresponding obscuration and decay.

There is obvious reason in this arrangement also. If the brain were to flourish under excessive toil, in a good cause, and suffer under the same degree of exertion only in a bad one, the order of nature would be deranged. Good men would no longer be men; they might dispense with food, sleep, repose, and every other enjoyment which binds them to the general company of mankind. But, according to the view which I am expounding, we are led to regard the constitution, modes of action, and relations of our organized system, as all instituted directly by the Creator;—birth from organized parents, growth, decay, and death in old age, appear as inherent parts of our frames, designedly allotted to us; while pain, disease, premature decay, and early death, appear, to a great extent, to be the consequences of not using our constitutions properly.

When, therefore, we see the children of good men snatched away by death in infancy or youth, we should ascribe that calamity to these children having inherited feebly organized bodies from their parents, or having, through ignorance or improper treatment, been led, in their modes of life, to infringe the laws which regulate organic matter. The object of their death seems to be to impress on the spectators the importance of attending to these laws, and to prevent the transmission of imperfect corporeal systems to future beings. If we see the children of the wicked flourishing in health and vigour, the inference is, that they have inherited strong constitutions from their parents, and have not in their own lives seriously transgressed the organic laws. We have no authority from our philosophy for supposing that Providence, in removing the just man's children, intends merely to try his faith or patience, to wean him from the world, or to give occasion for recompensing him hereafter for his suffering; nor for believing that the unjust man's family is permitted to flourish, with a view of aggravating his guilt by adding ingratitude for such blessing to his other iniquities in order to augment his punishment in a future life. We see, in these results, simply the consequences of obedience and disobedience to the laws impressed by the Creator on our constitution.

This principle delivers us from some perplexities and difficulties. When the children of good men are healthy, this circumstance is regarded as agreeable to the notions which we entertain of a just Providence. But when other men, not less excellent, have feeble children, who die prematurely and leave the parents overwhelmed with grief, the course of Providence is regarded as inscrutable; or, by way of reconciling it to reason, we are told that those whom God loveth he chasteneth. When, however, the wicked man's children die prematurely, this is regarded as a just punishment for the sins of the parents: but sometimes they live long, and are prosperous; and this is cited as an example of the long-suffering and loving-kindness of God!—The understanding is confounded by these contradictory theories, and no conclusions applicable to *our practical improvement* can be drawn from the events. When we look at the independence of the natural laws,—when we recognise the principle that obedience to each has its peculiar reward, and disobedience its appropriate punishment, we find that our difficulties diminish. The man who obeys every law but one, is punished for his single infraction; and he by whom one only is obeyed, does not, on account of his neglect of all the others, lose the reward of his solitary act of obedience.

It still remains true, that “those whom God loveth, he chasteneth,” because the punishments inflicted for the breach of his laws are instituted in love, to induce us to obey them for our own good: but we escape from the contradiction of believing that he sometimes shews his love by *punishing* men who *obey* his laws; which would be the case if he afflicted good men by bad health, or by the death of their children, merely as trials and chastisements, independently of their having infringed the laws of their organic constitution.

We avoid also another contradiction. The most religious persons who implicitly believe that disease is sent as a chastisement for sin, or in token of divine love, never hesitate, when they are sick, to send for a physician, and pay him large fees to deliver them as speedily as possible from this form of spiritual discipline. This is very inconsistent on their parts. The physician, however, proceeds at once to inquire into the *physical causes* which have disordered the patient's organization; he hears of wet feet, exposure to cold air, checked perspiration, excessive fatigue, or some similar influence, and he instantly prescribes

physical remedies, and it is often successful in removing the disorder. In all this proceeding, the common sense of the patient and physician leads them to practise the very doctrine which I am expounding. They view the suffering as the direct consequence of the departure of some of the bodily organs from their healthy course of action, and they endeavour to restore that state.

A striking illustration of the difference of practical result between the one and the other of these views of the divine administration is furnished by the history of the cholera. When it approached Edinburgh, a board of health was instituted under the guidance of *physicians*. They regarded the cholera simply as a *disease*, and they viewed disease as the result of disordered bodily functions. They, therefore, urged cleanliness, supplied nourishing food to the poor, and provided hospitals and medicine for the infected; and these means were, on the whole, surprisingly successful. Rome is at this moment threatened with the approach of cholera; but the Pope and his Cardinals are pleased to view it not as a disease, but as a religious dispensation; and what means do *they* use to prevent its approach? A friend in Rome, in a letter dated November 5. 1835, writes thus:—“A black image of the Virgin has lately been carried through the city by the Pope and all the Cardinals, for the express purpose of averting the cholera; so you see we are in a hopeful way, if it should assail us.” The cholera did attack Rome, and fifteen thousand persons fell victims to it, out of a population not much exceeding that of Edinburgh, where fewer than three thousand perished. Every reflecting mind must see the superiority of the precautions used in the city of Edinburgh, over those practised in Rome; yet the opinion that disease is the consequence of disordered bodily organs, and that the action of these organs is regulated by laws peculiar to themselves and distinct from the moral and religious laws, lies at the bottom of these different courses of action. My aim, you will perceive, is to bring our philosophy and our religious notions into harmony, and to render our practice consistent with both.

The human mind and its various faculties constitute a third class of objects which have received definite constitutions, and observe specific laws in their modes of action. These laws are inherent in the constitution of our mental faculties, and are divided into *moral, religious, and intellectual*. In the works on Phrenology, the faculties are treated of under corresponding divisions, viz., of Animal Propensities, Moral Sentiments, and Intellectual Powers; and the primitive functions, the spheres of activity, and the uses and abuses of each, are described, so far as these are ascertained. Each of these faculties is related to certain objects beneficial to man, which it desires, and there are laws regulating its action in attaining them:—the faculties are so far independent of each other, that we may pursue the objects of one or more of them, and omit the pursuit of the objects of the others:—the results of the action of the faculties are fixed and certain; and by knowing the primitive functions, the objects and the laws of our faculties, we may anticipate, with considerable certainty, the general issue of any course of conduct which we may systematically pursue: Farther—when we have acted in conformity with the harmonious dictates of all our faculties we shall find the issue pleasing and beneficial; whereas when we have yielded to the impulses of the lower propensities in opposition to the moral sentiments and enlightened intellect, which, in cases of conflict, are the ruling powers, we shall reap sorrow and disappointment.

I shall illustrate these principles by examples. The propensity of Acquisitiveness desires to acquire property; and this is its primitive function. If it act

Independently of intellect, as it does in idiots, and sometimes in children, it may lead to acquiring and accumulating things of no utility. If it be directed by enlightened intellect, it will desire to acquire and store up articles of real value. But it may act, either with or without the additional guidance of the moral sentiments. When it acts *without* that direction, it may prompt the individual to appropriate to himself things of value, regardless of justice, or of the rights of others. When acting in harmony with the moral sentiments, it will lead to acquiring property by just and lawful means.

Farther, it may act so far under the guidance of the moral sentiments, as never to invade the rights of others, and yet its action may terminate in its own gratification, without any fixed ulterior object. Thus, when a talented merchant carries on extensive commercial dealings, and acquires many thousands of pounds, all in an honourable way, he may do so without contemplating any good or noble end to be accomplished by means of his gains. Or, lastly, an individual may be animated by the desire to confer some substantial enjoyment on his family, his relatives, his country, or mankind, and perceiving that he cannot do so without wealth, he may employ his acquisitiveness, under the guidance of intellect and moral sentiment, to acquire property for the purpose of fulfilling this object. In this last case alone, can Acquisitiveness be said to act in harmony with all the other faculties. In the immediately preceding instance it acted in combination with justice, but not with Benevolence and Veneration.

According to my perceptions of the divine government, there are specified results attached by the Creator to each of the modes of action of the propensity. For example—When the propensity acts without intellect, the result, as I have said, is the accumulation of worthless trash. We see this occur occasionally in adult persons, who are not idiots in other matters, but who, under a blind Acquisitiveness, buy old books, old furniture, or any other object which they can obtain very cheap, or a *bargain*, as a cheap purchase is commonly called. I knew an individual who, under this impulse, at a sale of old military stores, bought a lot of worn-out drums. They were set up at sixpence each, and looked so large to the eye for the money, that he could not resist bidding for them. He had no use for them; they were unsaleable; and they were so bulky that it was expensive to store them. He was, therefore, under the necessity of bestowing them on the boys in the neighbourhood; who speedily made the whole district resound with unmelodious noises. In this and similar instances, as no law of morality is infringed, the punishment is simply the loss of the price paid.

When the propensity acts independently of justice and leads to stealing, the moral faculties of impartial spectators are offended, and prompt them to use speedy measures to restrain and punish the thief.

When Acquisitiveness acts in conformity with intellect and justice, but with no higher aim than its own gratification, the result is success in accumulating wealth, but the absence of satisfactory enjoyment of it. The individual feels his life pervaded by vanity and vexation of spirit; because, after he has become rich, he discovers himself to be without pursuit, object, or possession calculated to gratify his moral and religious feelings, which must be satisfied before full happiness can be experienced. This is the direct result of the constitution of the mind; for, as we possess moral faculties, moral objects alone can satisfy them; and mere wealth is not such an object.

When the aim of life is to communicate enjoyment to other beings, such as a family, relatives, or our fellow-citizens, and when Acquisitiveness is employed,

under the guidance of moral sentiment and intellect, for the purpose of accomplishing this end, success will generally be attained, and satisfaction will accompany it; because, through the whole course of life, the highest powers will have pursued a noble and dignified object, fitted for their gratification, and employed Acquisitiveness in its proper and subordinate capacity as their ministering servant. The faculties will have acted in harmonious combination.

I have mentioned that every faculty has a legitimate sphere of activity, and that happiness and duty consist in the proper application of them all. If we add to this the principle, that we cannot attain the rewards or advantages attached to the proper employment of any faculty, unless we apply it, we shall have another example illustrative of the order of the moral government of the world. For instance, as Providence has rendered property essential to our existence and welfare, and given us a faculty prompting us to acquire it; if any individual, born without fortune, shall neglect to exercise Acquisitiveness, and abandon himself, as his leading occupation, to the gratification of Benevolence and Veneration, in gratuitously managing public hospitals, in directing charity schools, or in preaching to the poor, he will suffer evil consequences. He must live on charity, or starve. In such a case, Benevolence and Veneration act without allowing due weight to the duties which Acquisitiveness is appointed by nature to perform. Moreover, in pursuing such a course of action, he neglects justice as a regular motive; for if he had listened to Conscientiousness, it would have dictated to him the necessity either of making these pursuits his profession, and acting for hire, or of practising another profession, and following them only in intervals of leisure. St Paul, in similar circumstances, wrought with his hands, and made tents, that he might be burdensome to no one.—The practical idea which I wish to fix in your minds by this example is, that if we pursue objects related exclusively to Benevolence and Veneration, although we may obtain them, we shall not thereby attain objects related to Acquisitiveness; and yet, that the world is so arranged, that we must attend to the objects of *all* our faculties, before we can properly discharge our duties, or be happy.

Not only so, but there are *modes* appointed in nature by which the objects of our different faculties may be attained; by pursuing which we are rewarded with success, and by neglecting which we are punished with failure. The object of Acquisitiveness, for example, is to acquire things of use. But these cannot be reared from the ground, nor constructed by the hand, nor imported from abroad in exchange for other commodities, without a great expenditure of time, labour, and skill. Their *values* indeed is, in general, measured by the time, labour, and skill, expended in their production. The great law, then, which God has prescribed to govern Acquisitiveness, and by observing which he promises it success, is, that we shall practise patient, laborious, and skilful exertion in endeavouring to attain its objects. "The hand of the diligent maketh rich" is the law of nature. When, however, men, losing sight of this divine law, resort to gaming and speculation, to thieving, cheating, and plundering, to acquire property; when "they *hasten* to become rich," they "fall into a snare." Ruin is the natural result of such conduct; because, according to nature, wealth can be produced only by labour; and although one acute, or strong, or powerful man may acquire wealth by cheating or plundering twenty or thirty honest and industrious neighbours, yet, as a general rule, their combined sagacity and strength will, in the end, defeat and punish him; while, if all, or even the majority, of men, endeavour to procure wealth

by mere speculation, stealing, and swindling, there would speedily be no wealth to acquire.

The Scripture authoritatively declares, "Thou shalt not steal;" but when a man with a strong Acquisitiveness, and defective Conscientiousness, enters into a great mercantile community, in which he sees vast masses of property daily changing hands, he often does not perceive the force of the prohibition; on the contrary, he thinks that he may, with manifest advantage, speculate, lie, cheat, swindle, perhaps steal, as a more speedy and effectual means of acquiring a share of that wealth, than by practising laborious industry. Nevertheless, this must be a delusion; because, although God does not state the reason why he prohibits stealing, it is certain that there must exist a reason replete with wisdom. He leaves it to human sagacity to discover the *philosophy of the precept*; and it is the duty of the Christian teacher, and moral philosopher, to unfold to the understandings of the young, why it is *disadvantageous*, as well as sinful, to break the commandments of God. If I merely desire a child not to cross a certain path, it will probably feel curiosity to discover what is on the other side of it, struggling against the dictates of filial reverence. If I should lead it to the path, and shew it a mighty stream which would swallow it up, curiosity would be satisfied, and a sense of its own danger would operate in aid of the injunction. Obedience would thereby be rendered easier, and more practicable. Thus it is also with moral duties. When the *philosophy of the practical precepts of the New Testament* shall be taught in schools, in the domestic circle, and from the pulpit, the whole power of intellectual conviction will be added to the authority of Scripture in enforcing them, and men will probably be induced, by a clear perception of their own interest in this world, as well as by their hopes and fears in relation to the next, to yield obedience to the laws of their Creator. What a glorious theme will such a philosophy afford to vigorous and enlightened minds for the instruction of the people!

Similar observations might be made in regard to the laws prescribed by nature for the regulation of all our faculties in the pursuit of their objects; but your time does not permit me to offer more than the preceding illustration.

If we look at the living world only in the mass, without knowing the distinct existence of the mental faculties, their distinct objects, and their distinct laws,—the results of their activity appear to be enveloped in painful confusion; we see some moral and religious men struggling with poverty, and others prosperous in their outward circumstances;—some rich men extremely unhappy, while others are apparently full of enjoyment;—some poor men joyous and gay, others miserable and repining;—some irreligious men in possession of vast wealth, while others are destitute of even the necessities of life. In short, the moral world appears to be one great chaos—a scene full of confusion, intricacy, and contradiction.

But if we become acquainted with the primitive faculties, and their objects and laws, and learn that different individuals possess them from nature in different degrees of strength, and also cultivate them with different degrees of assiduity, and that the consequences of our actions bear an established relation to the faculties employed, the mystery clears up. The religious and rich man is he who exercises both Veneration and Acquisitiveness according to the laws of their constitution; the religious and poor man is he who exercises Veneration, but who, through deficiency of the organ, through ignorance, or indolence, or some other cause, does not exercise Acquisitiveness at all, or not according to the laws by which its success is regulated. The rich man, who

is happy, is one who follows high pursuits related to his intellectual and moral sentiments, as the grand objects of life, and makes Acquisitiveness play its proper, but subordinate part. The rich man who is unhappy, is he who, having received from a bountiful Creator moral and intellectual faculties, has never cultivated them, but employed them merely to guide his Acquisitiveness in its efforts of accumulation, which he has made the leading object of his life. After he has succeeded, his moral sentiments and intellect, being left unprovided with employment, feel a craving discontent, which constitutes his unhappiness.

I might proceed through the whole list of the faculties, and their combinations, in a similar way; but it is unnecessary to do so, as these illustrations will, I hope, enable you to perceive the principle which I am anxious to expound.

Let us now take a brief and comprehensive survey of the point at which we have arrived.

If we are told that a certain person is extremely pious, benevolent, and just, we are entitled to conclude that he will experience within himself great peace, joy, and comfort, from his own dispositions; because these enjoyments flow directly from the activity of the organs which manifest piety, justice, and beneficence. We are entitled further to believe, that he will be esteemed and beloved by all good men who know him thoroughly, and that they will be disposed to promote, by every legitimate means, his welfare and happiness; because his mental qualities naturally excite into activity corresponding faculties in other men, and create a sympathetic interest on their part in his enjoyment. But if we hear that this good man has been upset in a coach, and has broken his leg, we conclude that this event has arisen from neglect of a physical law, which, being independent of the moral law, acted without direct relation to his mental qualities. If we hear that he is sick, we conclude, that in some organ of his body there has been a departure from the laws which regulate healthy action, and (these laws also being distinct) that the sickness has no direct relation to his moral condition. If we are told that he is healthy and happy, we infer that his organic system is acting in accordance with the laws of its constitution. If we are informed that he has suffered the loss of an intelligent and amiable son, in the bloom of life; we conclude either that the boy has inherited a feeble constitution from his parents, or that the treatment of his bodily system, in infancy and youth, has been, in some way or other, at variance with the organic laws, and that his death has followed as a natural consequence, which his father's piety could not avert.

If, on the other hand, we know a man who is palpably cold-hearted, grasping, and selfish, we are authorised to conclude—first, that he is deprived of that delicious sunshine of the soul, and all those thrilling sympathies with whatever is noble, beautiful, and holy, which attend the vivacious action of the moral and religious faculties; and, secondly, that he is deprived of the reflected influence of the same emotions from the hearts and countenances of the good men around him.

These are the direct punishments in this world for his not exercising his moral and religious powers. But if he have inherited a fine constitution, and if he be temperate, sober, and take regular exercise, he may reap the blessing of health, which he will enjoy as the reward of his compliance with the organic laws. There is no inconsistency in this enjoyment being permitted to him, because the moral and organic laws are distinct, and he has obeyed the laws which reward him. If his children have received from him a sound frame, and have been treated pru-

dently and skilfully, they also may live in health; but this, again, is the consequence of obedience to the same laws. If they have inherited feeble constitutions, or if they have been reared in a manner inconsistent with these laws, they will die, just as the children of good men in similar circumstances will perish. If the selfish man pursue wealth according to the laws that regulate its acquisition, he will, by that obedience, become rich; but if he neglect to exercise Acquisitiveness, or infringe these laws, he will become poor, just as the good man would become in similar circumstances.

It appears to me, that, in these arrangements, we see the dictates of our whole faculties, when acting in harmonious combination, supported by the order of external nature; and hence we obtain evidence of an actual moral government existing in full force and activity in this world.

According to this view, instead of there being confusion and a lack of justice in the Divine administration of human affairs, there is the reverse—there is a reward for every species of obedience, and a punishment for every species of disobedience to the Creator's laws. And, as if to preserve our minds habitually under the impression of discipline, our duties correspond to the different parts of our constitution; rewards and chastisements are annexed to each of them; and so little of favouritism or partiality is shewn, that, although we obey all the natural laws but one, we do not escape the punishment of infringing that single law, —and although we break them all but one, we are not denied the reward of that solitary instance of obedience.

But you will perceive, that, before you can comprehend this system of government, you must become acquainted with the objects in nature, by the action of which it takes place, whether these be external, or consist of our own bodies and minds. If mankind have hitherto lived without this knowledge, can you wonder that the ways of Providence have appeared dark and contradictory? And if, by means of Phrenology, we have now discovered the constitution of the mind, and its relationship to our bodies and external nature; if, moreover, physical science has largely opened up to us the constitution and laws of the objects by which we are surrounded and affected; need we feel surprise that the dawn of a new philosophy begins to break forth upon our vision,—a philosophy more consistent, more practical, more consolatory, and better adapted to the nature of man as a moral and intelligent being, than any that has hitherto appeared?

LECTURE III.

ADVANTAGE OF A KNOWLEDGE OF THE PRINCIPLES OF MORALS: DUTIES PRESCRIBED TO MAN AS AN INDIVIDUAL: SELF-CULTURE.

The views in the preceding lecture accord with those of Bishop Butler—We go farther than he did, and shew the natural arrangements by which the consequences mentioned by him take place—Importance of doing this—Certain relations have been established between the natural laws, which give to each a tendency to support the authority of the whole—Examples—Duties prescribed to man as an individual considered—The object of man's existence on earth is to advance in knowledge, wisdom, and holiness, and thereby to enjoy his being—The glory of God is promoted by his accomplishing this object—The first duty of man is to acquire knowledge—This may be drawn from Scripture, and from nature—Results from studying heathen mythology and nature are practically different—Difference between the old and the new philosophy stated—Clerical opposition to these lectures.

Having in the previous lectures considered what

constitutes an action right or wrong, and also the punishments which attend neglect of duty, and the rewards which performance bring along with it, I proceed to remark, that the views there unfolded correspond, to some extent, with those entertained by Bishop Butler, and which he has adopted as the groundwork of his treatise on the "Analogy of Natural and Revealed Religion." "Now," says he, "in the present state, all which we enjoy, and a great part of what we suffer, is put in our own power. For pleasure and pain are the consequences of our actions; and we are endued by the Author of our nature with capacities of foreseeing these consequences." "I know not that we have any one kind or degree of enjoyment, but by the means of our own actions. And, by prudence and care, we may, for the most part, pass our days in tolerable ease and quiet; or, on the contrary, we may, by rashness, ungoverned passion, wilfulness, or even by negligence, make ourselves as miserable as ever we please. And many do please to make themselves extremely miserable; i. e., they do what they know beforehand will render them so. They follow those ways, the fruit of which they know, by instruction, example, experience, will be disgrace, and poverty, and sickness, and untimely death. This every one observes to be the general course of things; though, it is to be allowed, we cannot find by experience that all our sufferings are owing to our own follies." (Part I. chap. 2.)

The common sense of mankind yields a ready assent to this doctrine. We go farther than Bishop Butler, by shewing the natural arrangements, according to which the consequences mentioned by him take place. This is a point of material moment in philosophy, and it leads me to remark, that one difference between the expositions of moral science which have been presented by preceding inquirers, and that which I am now endeavouring to elucidate, consists in this—that, hitherto, moralists generally have laid down precepts without shewing their foundation in our constitution, or the mode in which disregard of them is punished by the ordinary operation of natural causes. They were imperfectly acquainted with the constitution of the mind, and with the independent operation of the different natural laws, and, in consequence, failed in this branch of their subject. In their expositions of moral philosophy they resemble those who teach us to *præctica* an art, without explaining the scientific principles on which the practice is founded.

The difference between Paley's moral philosophy, and that which I am now teaching, may be illustrated thus: A practical brewer is a man who has been taught to steep barley in cold water for a certain time, to spread it on a stone floor for so many hours, to dry it on a kiln, at which point it is malt; to grind the malt, to mash it by pouring on it hot water, to boil the extract with hops, to cool it, to add yeast to it when cold, and to allow it to ferment for a certain number of days. A person of ordinary sagacity, who has seen these processes performed, will be able to repeat them, and he may thereby produce ale. But all the while he may know nothing of the laws of chemical action, by means of which the changes are evolved. He will soon observe, however, that the fermentation of the worts goes on sometimes too rapidly, sometimes too slowly, and that he makes bad ale: By experience he may discover what he considers causes of these effects; but he will frequently find that he has been wrong in his judgment of the causes, and he will do harm by his remedies. In short, he will learn that, although he knows the rules how to make good ale, the practice of them, with uniform success, surpasses his skill. The reason of his perplexity is this: The

barley is organized matter, which undergoes a variety of changes, depending partly on its own constitution and partly on the temperature of the air, on the quantity of moisture applied to it, the thickness of the heap in which it is laid, and other causes, of the precise nature and effects of which he is ignorant. Farther,—the extract from the malt, which he wishes to ferment, is a very active and delicate agent, undergoing rapid changes influenced by temperature, electricity, and other causes, of the operation of which also he knows nothing scientifically. If all the materials of his manufacture were passive, like stocks and stones, his practical rules might carry him much farther towards uniform and successful results; but, seeing that they are agents, and that their modes of action are affected by a variety of external causes and combinations, he cannot securely rely on producing the effects which he wishes to attain, 'until he becomes *scientifically* acquainted with the *qualities* of his materials, and the modifying influences of the agencies to the operations of which they are exposed. After attaining this knowledge, he becomes capable of suiting his practice to the circumstances in which, at each particular time, he finds his materials placed. If he cannot yet command the result, it is a proof that his knowledge is still imperfect.

This illustration may be applied to the subject of moral philosophy. In practical life we are ourselves active beings, and we are constantly influenced by agents, whose original tendencies and capacities differ from each other,—who are placed in varying circumstances, and who are acted on and excited or impeded by other beings. It is a knowledge of their nature alone, that can enable us to understand the phenomena of such beings occurring under the diversified circumstances in which they are placed. Moreover, when we know the *reason why* a particular line of conduct should be adopted, and the way in which reward is connected with performance, and punishment with neglect, there is a higher probability of the duty being discharged, than when a *precept* is our only motive to action. Mere rules may be apprehended and practised by ordinary minds; but to understandings ignorant of their foundations and sanctions in nature, their importance and authority are far from being so evident as to carry with them a deep *sensio* of obligation. A great musician may enable another, equally gifted, to feel the exquisite harmony of a certain composition; but he will strive in vain to convey the same feeling of it to a person destitute of musical talent. By teaching the laws of harmony, however, to this individual, he may succeed in *convincing his understanding* that, in the piece in question, these laws have been observed, and that there can be no good music without such observance.

Although the natural laws act separately and independently, certain relations have been established between them, which tend to support the authority of the whole. In consequence of these relations, obedience to each law increases our ability to observe the others, and disobedience to one diminishes, to some extent, our aptitude for paying deference to the rest.

The man, for example, who obeys the *physical* laws, avoids physical injury and suffering, and gains all the advantages arising from living in accordance with inanimate nature. He consequently places himself in a favourable condition to observe the *organic*, the *moral*, and the *intellectual* laws.

By obeying the *organic* laws, he ensures the possession of vigorous health; and when we view the muscular system of man as the instrument provided to him by the Creator for operating on physical nature, and the brain as the means of acting on sen-

tient and intelligent beings, we discover that organic health is a fundamental requisite of usefulness and enjoyment. We are led to see that the possession of it contributes, in the highest degree, to our obeying the physical laws, and also to our discharging our active duties: in other words, to our obeying the laws of morality and intellect. General obedience to the organic laws, also, by preserving the body in a favourable condition of health, fits it for recovering in the best manner from the effects of injuries sustained by inadvertent infringement of the physical laws. Disobedience to the organic laws, on the other hand, unfits us for obeying the other laws of our being. A student, for instance, who impairs his brain and digestive organs by excessive mental application and neglect of exercise, weakens his nervous and muscular systems, in consequence of which he becomes feeble, and incapable of sustained bodily exertion; in other words, of coping with the law of gravitation, without suffering pain and fatigue. He is, also, more liable to disease. A man who breaks the organic laws by committing a debauch, becomes for a season, incapable of intellectual application.

By obeying the moral and intellectual laws—that is, by exercising our whole mental faculties, according to the laws of their constitution, and directing them to their proper objects—we not only enjoy the direct pleasure which attends the favourable action and gratification of all our powers, but become more capable of coping with the physical influences which are constantly operating around us, and of bending them in subserviency to our interests and our will; and also of preserving all our organic functions in a state of regular vigour and activity.

In short, if we obey the various laws instituted by the Creator, we find that they act harmoniously for our welfare, that they support each other, and that the world becomes a clear field for the active and pleasurable exercise of all our powers; while, if we infringe one, not only does it punish us for the special act of disobedience, but the offence has the tendency to impair, to some extent, our power of obeying the others. So that we discover in the natural laws a system of independent, yet combined and harmonious action, admirably adapted to the mind of a being who has received not only observing faculties, fitted to study existing things and their phenomena, but reflecting intellect, calculated to comprehend their relations, adaptations, and reciprocal influences.

Thus, the first step in comprehending the principles of the Divine government, is to learn to look on the physical world as it actually exists, and not through the medium of a perverted imagination, or of erroneous assumptions; and the second is to compare it with the constitution of man, physical and mental, as designedly adapted to it. We shall find that it is not an elysium, and we know that we are not angels; but we shall discover that, while the heavens declare the glory of the Creator, and the revolving firmaments of suns and worlds proclaim His might, the elements and powers of man's mind and body, viewed in their tendencies and adaptations, bespeak, in a language equally clear and emphatic, His intelligence, beneficence, and justice.

Having thus expounded the general system of the Divine government, let us now consider the duties prescribed to us by our constitutions and its relations.

THE DUTIES PRESCRIBED TO MAN AS AN INDIVIDUAL.

Descending to particular duties, we may first consider those prescribed to man as an individual, by

his own constitution and that of the external creation.

The constitution of man seems to shew that the object of his existence on earth is to discharge certain duties, to advance in knowledge, refinement, beneficence, and holiness; and thereby to enjoy his being. Divines add, that another object is to "glorify God." According to my views, obedience to the Divine laws—or, performance of our duties—is the prime requisite; enjoyment is the natural accompaniment of this conduct; and the glory of God is evolved as the result of these two combined. His wisdom and power are strikingly conspicuous, when we discover a system, apparently complicated, to be, in fact, simple, clear, beautiful, and beneficent: and when we behold His rational creatures comprehending His will, acting in harmony with it, reaping all the enjoyments which His goodness intended for them, and ascending in the scale of being by the cultivation and improvement of their nobler powers, the glory of God appears surpassingly great. A deep conviction thence arises, that the only means by which we can advance that glory, is to promote, where possible, the fulfilment of the Creator's beneficent designs, and assiduously to co-operate in the execution of his plans. When the object of human existence is regarded in this light, it becomes evident that obedience to every natural law is a positive *duty* imposed on us by the Creator, and that infringement or neglect of it is a *sin* or transgression against His will. Hence, we do not promote the glory of God by singing His praises, offering up prayers at His throne, and performing other devotional exercises, if, at the same time, we shut our eyes to his institutions of nature, neglect the physical, organic, and moral laws, and act in direct contradiction to His plan of government, presenting ourselves before Him as spectacles of pain and misfortune, suffering the punishment of our infringements of His institutions, and ascribing those lamentable consequences of our own ignorance and folly to inherent imperfections in the world which He has made. Every law of God, however proclaimed to us, has an equal claim to observance; and as religion consists in revering God, and obeying His will, it thus appears that the discharge of our daily secular duties is literally the fulfilment of *an essential part of our religious obligations*.

It is only by presenting before the Creator our bodies in as complete a condition of health and vigour, our minds as thoroughly disciplined to virtue and holiness, and as replete with knowledge, and, in consequence, our whole being as full of enjoyment, as our constitution will admit, that we can really shew forth His goodness and glory.

If these ideas be founded in nature, the first duty of man as an individual is obviously to acquire knowledge of himself and of God's laws, in whatever record these are contained. I infer this to be a duty, because I perceive intellectual powers bestowed on him, obviously intended for the purpose of acquiring knowledge; and not only a wide range of action permitted to all his powers, corporeal and mental, with pleasure annexed to the use, and pain to the abuse of them: but also a liability to suffer by the influence of the objects and beings around him, unless, by means of knowledge, he accommodate his conduct to their qualities and action. He has only one alternative presented to him—of using his reason, or of enduring evil.

It has too rarely been inculcated that the gaining of knowledge is a *moral duty*; and yet, if our constitution be so framed that we cannot securely enjoy life, and discharge our duties as parents and members of society without it, and if a capacity for acquiring it has been bestowed on us, its acquisition is obviously

commanded by the Creator as a duty of the highest moment. The kind of knowledge which we are bound to acquire is clearly that of God's will and laws. It is the office of divines to instruct you in the duties prescribed in the Bible; and of philosophers to teach the department of nature.

The ignorant man suffers many inconveniences and distresses to which he submits as inevitable dispensations of Providence: his own health perhaps fails him; his children are perverse and disobedient; his trade is unsuccessful; and he regards all these as visitations from God, or as examples of the chequered lot of man on earth. If he be religious, he prays for a spirit of resignation, and directs his hopes to heaven: but if the foregoing view of the divine administration be sound, he should ascribe his sufferings, in great part, to his own ignorance of the scheme of creation, and to his non-compliance with its rules. In addition to his religious duties, he should, therefore, fulfil the natural conditions appointed by the Creator as antecedents to happiness; and then he may expect a blessing on his exertions and on his life.

Important, however, as the knowledge of nature thus appears to be, it is surprising how recently the efficient study of it has begun. It is not more than three centuries since the very dawn of inductive philosophy; and some of the greatest scientific discoveries have been made within the last fifty or sixty years. These facts tell us plainly that the race of man, like the individual, is progressive; that it has its infancy and youth; and that we who now exist live only in the dayspring of intelligence. In Europe and America, the race may be viewed as putting forth the early blossoms of its rational existence; while the greater part of the world lies buried in utter darkness. And even in Europe, it is only the more gifted minds who see and appreciate their true position. These, from the Pisgah of knowledge, gaze upon the promised land of virtue and happiness stretched out before their intellectual eye; although it is too remote to admit of their entrance on its soil, yet it lies sufficiently near to permit them to desecrate its beauty and luxuriance.

If the study of nature and nature's laws be our first duty as rational and accountable beings, a moment's reflection will satisfy you that the instruction hitherto generally given even to the young of the higher ranks, has been unavailing for purposes of practical utility. If a boy be taught the structure, uses, and laws of action of the lungs, he will be furnished with motives for avoiding sudden transitions of temperature, excessive bodily and mental exertion, and sleeping in ill-ventilated rooms; for improving the purity of the air in his native city; for constructing churches, theatres, lecture-rooms, and all places of public resort, in accordance with the laws of the human constitution in regard to temperature and ventilation; in short, this knowledge will enable him to avoid much evil and to accomplish much practical good. If he do not acquire it, he will be exposed, in consequence of his ignorance, to suffer from many of these external influences, operating injuriously both on his body and mind. If, on the other hand, he be taught that Romulus and Remus were suckled by a she-wolf; that Æneas was the son of Venus, who was the goddess of love; that in Tartarus were three Furies, called Alecto, Tisiphone, and Megæra, who sent wars and pestilence on earth, and punished the wicked after death with whips of scorpions; that Jupiter was the son of Saturn, and the chief among all the gods; that he dwelt on Mount Olympus, and employed one-eyed giants called Cyclops, whose workshop was in the heart of Mount Ætna, to forge thunderbolts, which he threw down on the world when he was angry—the youth learns mere poetical

fancies, often abundantly ridiculous and absurd, which lead to no useful actions. As all the personages of the heathen mythology existed only in the imaginations of poets and sculptors, they are not entities or agents; and do not operate in any way whatever on human enjoyment: The boy who has never dedicated his days and nights to the study of them does not suffer punishment for his neglect; which he infallibly does for his ignorance of nature's laws. Neither is he rewarded for acquiring such knowledge, as he is by becoming acquainted with nature, which always enables him to do something that otherwise he could not have done; to reap some enjoyment which otherwise he could not have reached; or to avoid an evil which otherwise would have overtaken him. Jupiter throws no thunderbolts on those who neglect the history of his amours and of his war with the Giants; the Furies do not scourge those who are ignorant that, according to some writers, they sprang from the drops of blood which issued from a wound inflicted by Saturn upon his father Cælus, and that, according to others, they were the daughters of Pluto and Proserpine; and the she-wolf does not bite us, although we be not aware that she suckled the founders of Rome—or, to speak more correctly, that credulous and foolish historians have said so. But if we neglect the study of God's laws, evil and misery most certainly ensue.

These observations, however, are not to be understood as an unqualified denunciation of classical learning. The sentiment of Ideality finds gratification in poetic fictions: but it is absurd to cultivate it and the faculty of Language to the exclusion of others not less important; and besides, it must be kept in view, that in the pages of the Book of Nature, as well as in those of Homer, Virgil, and Ovid, ample materials are to be found for the cultivation and gratification of a refined taste.

The religious teachers of mankind, also, in the education of their flocks, have too generally omitted instruction in the natural laws of God. The pastors of every sect have been more anxious to instil into the minds of the young peculiar views of religious faith, than a correct and practical knowledge of the divine wisdom and will inscribed in the Book of Nature. In consequence, even the best educated classes are, in general, very imperfectly informed regarding Nature, her laws, and her rewards and punishments. They have been instructed in classical literature, composed chiefly of elegant and ingenious fables; a certain portion of the people at large has been taught to read and write, but left at that point to grope their way to knowledge without teachers, without books, and without encouragement or countenance from their superiors; while countless multitudes have been left without any education whatever. In no country have the occupations of society, and the plan of life of individuals, been deliberately adopted in just appreciation of the order of nature. We ought, therefore, in reason, to feel no surprise that the very complex mechanism of our individual constitution, and the still more complicated relations of our social condition, frequently move harshly, and sometimes become deranged. It would have been miraculous indeed, if a being deliberately framed to become happy only in proportion to his attainments in knowledge and morality, had found himself, while yet in profound ignorance of himself, of the world, and of their mutual adaptations, in possession of all the comforts and enjoyments of which his cultivated nature is susceptible.

As *individuals*, our sphere of intellectual vision is so limited, that we have great difficulty in discovering the indispensable necessity of knowledge to the discharge of our duties, and the promotion of our happiness. We are too apt to believe that our lot is

immutably fixed, and that we can do extremely little to change or improve it. We feel as if we were overruled by a destiny too strong for our limited powers to control: And, as if to give strength and permanence to this impression, the man of the world asks us, What benefit could scientific information confer on the labourer, whose duty consists in digging ditches, in breaking stones or in carrying loads all day long; and when the day is gone, whose only remaining occupation is to eat, sleep, and propagate his kind? Or of what use is information concerning nature's laws to the shopkeeper, whose duty in life is to manage his small trade, to pay his bills punctually, and to collect sharply his outstanding debts? If these were *all* the duties of the labourer and of the shopkeeper, the man of the world would be right. But we discover in the individuals to whom these duties are allotted, faculties capable of far higher aims, and Nature points out the necessity of cultivating them. The scheme of life of the day-labourer and of the shopkeeper, as now cast, is far short of the improvement which it is capable of reaching, and which it was evidently designed to attain. It does not afford scope for the exercise of their noblest and best gifts; and it does not favour the steady advance of these classes as moral, religious, and intellectual beings.

The objector assumes that they have already reached the limits of their possible attainments; and if the case were so, the conclusion might be sound, that science is useless to them. But if they be at present far from enjoying the full sweets of existence: if the whole order of social life, and their condition in it, be capable of vast amelioration; and if the knowledge of ourselves and of nature be a means of producing these advantages; then the duty of acquiring knowledge is at once fundamental and paramount—it lies at the foundation of all improvement. If the mass of the people be destined never to rise above their present condition of ignorance, suffering, and toil, we must abandon the idea that the attributes of justice and benevolence are manifested by God in this world.

I am anxious to press this idea earnestly on your consideration, because it appears to me to constitute the grand difference between the old and the new philosophy. The characteristic feature of the old philosophy, founded on the knowledge, not of man's nature, but of his political history, is, that Providence intended different lots for men (a point in which the new philosophy agrees), and that, in the divine appointment of conditions, the millions, or masses of the people, were destined to act the part only of industrious ministers to the physical wants of society, while a favoured few were meant to be the sole recipients of knowledge and refinement. It was long regarded, not only as Utopian, but as actually baneful and injurious to the happiness of the industrious classes themselves, to open up their minds to high and comprehensive views of their own capabilities and those of external nature; because it was said that such ideas might render them discontented with the condition which the arrangements of the Creator have assigned to them. According to the old philosophy, therefore, it is not a duty imposed on every individual to exercise his intellectual powers in extending his acquaintance with nature; on the contrary, according to it, a working man fulfils his destiny when he becomes master of his trade, acquires a knowledge of his moral and religious duties from the Bible, and quietly practises them, rears a family of labourers, and, unmoved by ambition, unenlightened by science, and unrefined by accomplishments, sinks into the grave, in a good old age, to give place to an endless succession of beings like himself. Human nature was viewed as

stationary, or at least regarded as depending for its advance on Providence, or on the higher classes, and in no degree on humbler men.

The new philosophy, on the other hand, or that which is founded on a knowledge of man's nature admits the allotment of distinct conditions to different individuals, because it recognises differences in their mental and bodily endowments; but in surveying the human faculties it discovers that all men possess, in a greater or less degree, powers of observation and reflection adapted to the study of nature; the sentiment of Ideality prompting them to desire refinement and perfect institutions; the feeling of Benevolence longing for universal happiness; the sentiment of Conscientiousness rejoicing in justice, and emotions of Hope, Veneration, and Wonder, causing the glow of religious devotion to spring up in their souls, and their whole being to love, worship, and obey the beneficent Author of their existence. And it proclaims that beings so gifted were not destined to exist as mere animated machinery, liable to be superseded at every stage of their lives by the steam-engine, the pulley, or the lever; but were clearly intended to advance in their mental attainments, and to rise higher and higher in the scale of intelligence, virtue, and happiness.

This conclusion is irresistible, if the general idea of the divine administration, communicated in the previous lecture, be sound,—viz., that all the evolutions of physical nature proceed under fixed, independent, and harmonious laws. Under such a system, the Creator speaks forth from every element, and proclaims that every human being must acquire knowledge or suffer evil. As it is not probable that the Creator has bestowed capacities and desires on his creatures which their inevitable condition renders it impossible for them to cultivate and gratify, we may reasonably presume that the fulfilment of every necessary duty is compatible with enlarged mental attainments in the race. There are, no doubt, humble minds, incapable of high cultivation, who are adapted to the humble stations of life, but they do not constitute the majority of mankind; they are susceptible of improvement far beyond their present attainments, and in a thoroughly moral and enlightened community, no useful office will be degrading; nor will any be incompatible with the due exercise of the highest faculties of man.

It is delightful to perceive that these views are gaining ground, and are daily more and more advocated by the press. I recommend to your perusal a work just published (1835), entitled, "My Old House, or the Doctrine of Changes," in which they are ably and eloquently enforced. Speaking of the purposes of God in the administration of the world, the author observes, that "the great error of mankind, on this subject, has at all times been, that feeling themselves, at least in the vast multitude of cases, to occupy (by the ordination of Providence, or by what they commonly consider as their unfortunate lot in life), but a very obscure and laborious station in the household, they are apt to think that it matters little with what spirit they advance to their toils,—that they cannot be in a condition to give any appreciable advancement to the plans of the Master—and that, at any rate, if they do not altogether desert their place, and permit it to run into disorder, they have done all that can well be expected from them, or that they are indeed in a condition to do, for the progressive good of the whole. Take, for instance, the condition of a person, who, in the lowest and obscurest lot of life, is entrusted with the bringing up of a family—and how often do we hear from such persons the complaint, that all their cares are insufficient for the moment that is passing over their heads—and that, provided they can obtain the mere

necessaries of life, they cannot be required to look to any higher purposes which may be obtained by their cares. And yet, what situation in life is in reality more capable of being conducted in the most efficient and productive manner, or more deserving the nicest and most conscientious care of those entrusted with it? For are not the hearts and understanding of the young committed to the immediate care of those who chiefly and habitually occupy the important scenes of domestic life—and if they pay a due regard, not only to the temporal, but to the moral and intellectual, interests of their charge—if they make home the seat of all the virtues which are so appropriately suited to it—if they set the example—an example which is almost never forgotten—of laborious worth struggling, it may be, through long years, and yet never disheartened in its toils—and if, by these means, they make their humble dwelling a scene of comfort, of moral training, and of both material and moral beauty, which attracts the eye and warms the hearts of all who witness it—how truly valuable is the part which such servants of the Master have been enabled to perform for the due regulation of all the parts of his household—and when their day of labour is done, and the cry goeth forth, 'Call the labourers to their reward,' with what placid confidence may they advance to receive the recompense of their toils—and be satisfied, as they prepare themselves for 'the rest that awaits them,' that, though their lot in life has been humble, and their toils obscure, they have yet not been unprofitable servants, and that the results of their labours shall yet be 'seen after many days.'" "The same style of thought may be applied to all the varied offices which human life, even in its lowest forms, and most unnoticed places, can be found to present—and when these varied conditions and duties of the 'humble poor' are so considered, it will be found that a new light seems to diffuse itself over the whole plan of the divine kingdom—and that no task which the Master of the household can assign to any of his servants, is left without inducements to its fulfilment, which may prepare the labourer for the most cheerful and delighted attention to his works." (P. 84.) How important is knowledge to the due fulfilment of the humble, yet respectable duties here so beautifully described!

I conclude this lecture by observing that the duty of acquiring knowledge implies that of communicating it to others when attained; and there is no form in which the humblest individual may do more good, or assist more effectually in promoting the improvement and happiness of mankind, than in teaching them truth and its applications. I feel that we lie under a moral obligation to communicate to you who, by your attendance here, testify your desire of instruction) the knowledge concerning the natural laws of the Creator, which my own mind has been permitted to discover. I learn that other instructors of the people have considered it to be *their* duty, to renounce, as *dangerous*, the knowledge which is here communicated, and to warn you against it.* But I am not moved by such declamations. What I teach you, I believe to be truth inscribed by the hand of God in the book of nature; and I have never been able to understand what is meant by a *dangerous* truth. All natural truth is simply knowledge of what

These Lectures were reported in one of the newspapers in Edinburgh, and during the delivery of them, more than one of the clergy of the Established Church preached sermons against them. The audience to whom they were addressed belong to that class of society over whom the clergy exercise the most powerful influence, and this appeal appeared to be called for to induce them to continue their attendance. In this respect, it was successful.

the Creator has instituted; and it savours of impiety, and not of reverence, to stigmatise it as injurious. The very opposite is the fact. Lord Bacon has truly said, that "there are, besides the authority of Scripture, two reasons of exceeding great weight and force, why religion should dearly protect all increase of natural knowledge: the one because it leads to the greater exaltation of the glory of God; for, as the Psalms and other Scriptures do often invite us to consider and to magnify the great and wonderful works of God, so if we should rest only in the contemplation of those which first offer themselves to our senses, we should do a like injury to the majesty of God, as if we should judge of the store of some excellent jeweller, by that only which is set out to the street in his shop. The other reason is, because it is a singular help, and a preservative against unbelief and error; for, says our Saviour, ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures nor the power of God; laying before us two books or volumes to study, if we will be secured from error—first, the Scriptures, revealing the will of God; and then the creatures expressing his power." We have seen, however, that not the *power* of God only, but also his *will*, is expressed in the constitution of "the creatures;" and hence a double reason becomes manifest why it is our duty to study them.

It would seem, therefore, that the instructors alluded to have assumed that it is not truth, but error, which is inculcated in this place. If they had pronounced such an opinion after inquiry, and for reasons stated, I should have been ready to listen to their objections, and reconsider my views; but they have condemned us unheard and untried—assuming boldly that, because we teach ideas different from their own individual notions, we are necessarily in error. This assumption indicates merely that our accusers have not arrived at the same perceptions of the Divine government with ourselves—a result that will by no means be wondered at by any one who considers that they have not followed the course of inquiry pursued by us. There is, however, some reason for surprise, that their opinions should be advanced as unquestionably superior to, and exclusive of, those of other men, adopted after patient observation and thought,—seeing that in many of them are the emanations of a dark age, in which the knowledge of Nature's laws did not exist, and that they are prohibited, under pain of forfeiting their livings, from changing their tenets, even although they should see them to be erroneous.*

I advance here, for your acceptance, no propositions based on the authority of my own discernment alone; but I submit them all to your scrutiny and judgment. I enable you, as far as in me lies, to detect the errors into which I may inadvertently have fallen, and ask you to embrace only the ideas which seem to be supported by evidence and reason. We are told by a great authority, to judge of all things by their fruits; and, by this test, I leave the doctrines of this philosophy to stand or fall. What are the effects of them on your minds? Do you feel your conceptions of the Deity circumscribed and debased by the views which I have presented—or, on the contrary, purified and exalted? In the simplicity, adaptations, and harmony of Nature's laws, do you not recognise positive and tangible proof of the omniscience and omnipotence of the Creator—a solemn and impressive lesson, that in every moment of our existence, we live, and move, and have our being, supported by his power, rewarded by his goodness,

and restrained by his justice? Does not this sublime idea of the continual presence of God now cease to be a vague, and therefore a cold and barren conception; and does it not, through the medium of the natural laws, become a deep-felt, encouraging, and controlling reality? Do your understandings revolt from such a view of creation, as ill adapted to a moral, religious, and intelligent being? or do they ardently embrace it, and leap with joy at light evolving itself from the moral chaos, and exhibiting order and beauty, authority and rule, in a vast domain where previously darkness, perplexity, and doubt prevailed? Do you feel your own nature debased by viewing every faculty as calculated for virtue, yet so extensive in its range, that when it moves blindly and without control it may find a sphere of action even beyond virtue, in the wild regions of vice? Or do you perceive in this constitution a glorious liberty—yet the liberty only of moral beings, happy when they follow virtue, and miserable when they offend? In teaching you that every action of your lives has a consequence of good or evil annexed to it, according as it harmonizes with, or is in opposition to, the laws of God, do I promise impunity to vice, and thereby give a loose rein to the impetuosity of passion—or do I set up around the youthful mind a hedge and circumvallation, within which it may expatiate in light, and liberty, and joy; but beyond which lie sin and inevitable suffering,—weeping, wailing, and gnashing of teeth? Let the tree, I say, be known by its fruits. Look to heaven, and see if the doctrines which I teach have circumscribed or darkened the attributes of the Supreme; then turn your contemplation inwards, and examine whether they have degraded or exalted,—chilled or inspired with humble confidence and hope,—the soul which God has given you; and by your verdict, pronounced after this consideration, let the fate of the doctrines be sealed. In teaching them, be it repeated, I consider myself to be discharging a moral duty; and no frown of men will tempt me to shrink from proceeding in such a course. If my exposition of the Divine government be true, it is a noble vocation to proclaim it to the world; for the knowledge of it must be fraught with blessings and enjoyment to man. It would be a cold heart and a coward soul, that, with such convictions, should fear the face of clay; and only a demonstration of my being in error, or the hand of the destroyer Death, shall arrest my course in proclaiming any knowledge that I possess which promises to augment the virtue and happiness of mankind. If you participate in these sentiments, let us advance and fear not—encouraged by the assurance, that if this doctrine be of man it will come to nought, but that if it be of God, no human authority can prevail against it!

LECTURE IV.

PRESERVING BODILY AND MENTAL HEALTH, A MORAL DUTY; AMUSEMENTS.

The preservation of health is a moral duty—Causes of bad health are to be found in infringement of the organic laws—All the bodily organs must be preserved in proportionate vigour—The pleasures attending high health are refined, and distinguishable from sensual pleasures—The habits of the lower animals are instructive to man in regard to health—Labour is indispensable to health—Fatal consequences of continued, although slight, infractions of the organic laws—Amusements necessary to health and therefore not sinful—We have received faculties of Time, Tune, Identity, Imitation, and Wit, calculated to invent and practise amusements—their uses and abuses stated

* The Church of Scotland recently deposed from the ministry the author of "My Old House, or the Doctrine of Changes," quoted on page 18, on account of what they considered to be the heresy of his opinions.

—Error of religious persons who condemn instead of purifying and improving public amusements.

The next duty of man, as an individual, is to apply his knowledge in preserving himself in health, bodily and mental. Without health he is unfit for the successful discharge of his duties. It is so advantageous and agreeable to enjoy sound health, that many persons will exclaim, "No prophet is needed to inform us that it is our duty and our interest sedulously to guard it;" but many who treat thus lightly the general injunction, are grievously deficient in practical knowledge how to carry it into effect. It is true that every man in his senses takes care not to fall into the fire or walk into a pool of water; but how many valuable lives are put in jeopardy by sitting in wet clothes, by overtasking the brain in study or in the cares of business, by too frequently repeated convivialities, or other habits that sap the foundations of health!

In tracing to their source the calamities which arise to families and individuals from bad health and untimely death, attended by deep laceration of their feelings and numerous privations, it is surprising how many of them may be discovered to arise from slight but long continued deviations from the dictates of the organic laws; apparently so trivial at first that scarcely any injurious or even disagreeable result was observed, but which, nevertheless, were from the beginning important errors, whose injurious consequence constantly increased. Perhaps the victim had an ardent mind, and, under the impulse of a laudable ambition to excel in his profession, studied with so much intensity, and for such long periods in succession, that he overtasked his brain, and ruined his health. His parents and relations, equally ignorant with himself of the organic laws, were rejoicing in his diligence, and forming fond expectations of the brilliant future that must, in their estimation, await one so gifted in virtuous feeling, in intellect, and in industry; when suddenly he was seized with fever, with inflammation, or with consumption, and in a few days or weeks was carried to the tomb. The heart bleeds at the sight; and the ways of Providence appear hard to be reconciled with our natural feelings and expectations; yet when we trace the catastrophe to its first cause, it is discovered to have had no mysterious or vindictive origin. The habits which appeared to the spectators so praiseworthy, and calculated to lead to such excellent attainments, were practically erroneous, and there was not one link wanting to complete the connection between them and the evil which they induced.

Another cause by which health and life are frequently destroyed, is *occasional* reckless conduct, pursued in ignorance of the laws of the human constitution. Take as an example the following case, which I have elsewhere given:—A young man in a public office, after many months of sedentary occupations, went to the country on a shooting excursion, where he exhausted himself by muscular exertion, of which his previous habits had rendered him little capable: he went to bed feverish, and perspired much during the night: next day he came to Edinburgh, unprotected by a greatcoat, on the outside of a very early coach: his skin was chilled, the perspiration was checked, the blood received an undue determination to the interior vital organs, disease was excited in the lungs, and within a few weeks he was consigned to the grave.

I received an interesting communication in illustration of the topic which I am now discussing, from a medical gentleman well known in the literary world by his instructive publications. His letter was suggested by a perusal of the "Constitution of Man." "On four several occasions," says he, "I

have nearly lost my life from infringing the organic laws. When a lad of fifteen, I brought on a brain fever (from excessive study) which nearly killed me; at the age of nineteen I had an attack of peritonitis (inflammation of the lining membrane of the abdomen) occasioned by violent efforts in wrestling and leaping; and while in France, nine years ago, I was laid up with pneumonia (inflammation of the lungs) brought on by dissecting in the great galleries of La Pitié with my coat and hat off in the month of December, the windows next to me being constantly open; and in 1829 I had a dreadful fever, occasioned by walking home from a party, at which I had been dancing, in an exceeding cold morning, without a cloak or greatcoat. I was for four months on my back, and did not recover perfectly for more than eighteen months. All these evils were entirely of my own creating, and arose from a foolish violation of laws which every sensible man ought to observe and regulate himself by. Indeed I have always thought—and your book confirms me more fully in the sentiment—that, by proper attention, crime and disease and misery of every sort, could, in a much greater measure than is generally believed, be banished from the earth, and that the true method of doing so is to instruct people in the laws which govern their own frame."^{*}

The great requisite of health is the preservation of *all* the leading organs of the body in a condition of regular and *proportionate* activity; to allow none to become too languid, and none too active. The result of this harmonious activity is a pleasing consciousness of existence, experienced when the mind is withdrawn from all exciting objects and turned inward on its own feelings. A philosophical friend once remarked to me, that he never considered himself to be in complete health, except when he was able to place his feet firmly on the turf, his hands hanging carelessly by his sides, his eyes wandering over space, and thus circumstanced, to feel such agreeable sensations arising in his mere bodily frame, that he could raise his mind to heaven, and thank God that he was a living man. This description of the quiet, pleasing enjoyment which accompanies complete health, appears to me to be admirable. It can hardly be doubted, that the Creator intended that the mere play of our bodily organs should yield us pleasure. It is probable that this is the chief gratification enjoyed by the inferior animals; and although we have received the high gift of reason, it does not necessarily follow that we should be deprived of the delights which our organic nature is fairly calculated to afford. How different is the enjoyment which I have described, arising from the temperate, active, harmonious play of every bodily function,—from sensual pleasure, which results from the abuse of a few of our bodily appetites, and is followed by lasting pain; and yet so perverted are human notions, in consequence of ignorance and vicious habits, that thousands attach no idea to the phrase *bodily pleasure*, but that of *sensual indulgence*. The pleasurable feelings springing from health are delicate and refined; they are the supports and rewards of virtue, and altogether incompatible with vicious gratification of the appetites. So widely do the habits of civilized life depart from the standards of nature, that I fear this enjoyment is known, in its full exquisiteness, to comparatively few. Too many of us, when we direct our attention to our bodily sensations, experience only feelings of discomfort, anxiety, and discontent, which make us fly to an external pursuit, that we may escape from ourselves.

* The author of this letter was Dr Robert Macnish, and I regret to say, that since it was written he has fallen a victim to another attack of fever.

This undefined uneasiness is the result of slight, but extensive derangement of the vital functions, and is the prelude of future disease. The causes of these uneasy feelings may be traced in our erroneous habits, occupations, and physical condition; and until society shall become so enlightened as to adopt extensive improvements in all these particulars, there is no prospect of their termination.

It is instructive to compare with our own the modes of life of the lower animals, whose actions and habits are directly prompted and regulated by the Creator, by means of their instincts; because, in all circumstances in which our constitution closely resembles theirs, their conduct is really a lesson read to us by the Allwise himself. If, then, we survey them attentively, we observe that they are incited to a course of action calculated to produce harmonious activity in all their vital organs, and thus insure their possession of health. Animals in a state of nature are remarkably cleanly in their habits. You must have observed the feathered tribes dressing their plumage and washing themselves in the brooks. The domestic cat is most careful to preserve a clean, sleek, glossy skin; the dog rolls himself on grass or straw; and the horse, when grazing, does the same, if he has not enjoyed the luxury of being well curried. The sow, although our standard of comparison for dirt, is not deserving of this character. It is invariably clean, wherever it is possible for it to be so; and its bad reputation arises from its masters, too frequently, leaving it no sphere of existence except dunghills and other receptacles of filth. In a stable-yard, where there is abundance of clean straw, the sleeping-place of the sow is unsoiled, and the creature makes great efforts to preserve it in this condition.

Again—In a state of nature there has been imposed on the inferior animals, in acquiring their food, an extent of labour, which amounts to regular exercise of their corporeal organs. And lastly, their food has been so adjusted to their constitutions, that without cookery they are well nourished, but very rarely rendered sick through surfeit, or the bad quality of what they eat. I speak always of animals in a state of nature. The domestic cow, which has stood in a house for many months, when first turned into a clover-field in summer, occasionally commits a surfeit; but she would not do so if left on the hill-side, and allowed to pick up her food by assiduous exertion. The animals, I repeat, are impelled directly by the Creator to act in the manner now described; and when we study their organization, and see its close resemblance to the human frame, we cannot fail, while we admire the wisdom and benevolence displayed in their habits and constitution, hence to draw lessons for the regulation of our own.

Man differs from the brutes in this—that, instead of blind instincts, he is furnished with reason, which enables him to study himself, the external world, and their mutual relations; and to pursue the conduct which these point out as beneficial. It is by examining the structure, modes of action, and objects, of the various parts of his constitution, that man discovers what his duties of performance and abstinence in regard to health, really are. This proposition may be illustrated in the following manner. The skin has innumerable pores, and serves as an outlet for the waste particles of the body. The quantity of noxious matter excreted through these pores in twenty-four hours is, on the very lowest estimate, about twenty-four ounces. If the passage of this matter be obstructed so that it is retained in the body, the quality of the blood is deteriorated by its presence, and the general health, which greatly depends on the state of the blood, suffers. The nature of perspired matter is such, that it is apt, in conse-

quence of the evaporation of its watery portion, to be condensed and clog the pores of the skin; and hence the necessity for washing the surface frequently, so as to keep the pores open, and allow perspiration freely to proceed. The clothing, moreover, must be so porous and clean, as readily to absorb and allow a passage to the matter perspired, otherwise the same result ensues as from the impurity of the skin, namely, the arrest, or diminution, of the process of perspiration. Nor is this all. The skin is an absorbing as well as an excreting organ, and foreign substances in contact with it are sucked into its pores and introduced into the blood. When cleanliness is neglected, therefore, the evil consequences are twofold; first, the pores, as we have mentioned, are clogged, and perspiration obstructed; and, secondly, part of the noxious matter left on the skin or clothing, is absorbed into the system, where it produces hurtful effects. From such an exposition of the structure and functions of the skin, the necessity for cleanliness of person and clothing becomes abundantly evident; and the corresponding duty is more likely to be performed by those who know these details, and are convinced of their importance, than by persons impelled by injunctions alone. In some parts of the East, ablution of the body is justly regarded as a duty of religion; but you need not be told how extensively this duty is neglected in our own country. When men become enlightened, attention to cleanliness will be regarded as an important duty, akin to temperance, honesty, or piety.

I might, in like manner, describe the structure and modes of action of the bones, muscles, bloodvessels, nerves, and brain; and demonstrate to you that the necessity for bodily and mental labour, for temperance, for attention to ventilation, for judicious clothing, and a great variety of other observances, is written by the finger of God in the framework of our bodies. This, however, belongs to Physiology; and here I assume that you have studied and understand the leading facts of that subject. I limit myself to two observations. *First*, Exercise of the bones and muscles is labour; and labour, instead of being a curse to man, is a positive source of his wellbeing and enjoyment.—It is only excessive labour that is painful; and in a well ordered community there should be no necessity for painfully exhausting exertion. *Secondly*, Exercise of the brain is synonymous with mental activity, which may be intellectual, or moral, or animal, according to the faculties which we employ. Mental inactivity, therefore, implies inactivity of the brain; and as the brain is the fountain of nervous energy to the whole system, the punishment of neglecting its exercise is great and severe—consisting in feelings of lassitude, uneasiness, fear and anxiety; vague desires, sleepless nights, and a general consciousness of discomfort, with incapacity to escape from suffering; all which poison life at its source, and render it thoroughly miserable. Well regulated mental activity, combined with due bodily exercise, on the other hand, is rewarded with gay, joyous feelings, an inward alacrity to discharge all our duties, a good appetite, sound sleep, and a general consciousness of happiness that causes days and years to fleet away without leaving a trace of physical suffering behind.

While moderate and proportionate exercise of all the bodily and mental functions is essential to health, we must be equally careful, in order to preserve this invaluable blessing, to shun over-exertion and excessive mental excitement. Owing to the constitution of British society, it is very difficult to avoid, in our habitual conduct, one or other of the extremes now mentioned. Many persons, born to wealth, have few motives to exertion; and such individuals, particularly females, often suffer grie-

vously in their health and happiness from want of rational objects of pursuit, calculated to excite and exercise their minds and bodies. Others, again, who do not inherit riches from their ancestors, are tempted to overtask themselves in acquiring them, frequently to support an expensive style of living, which vanity leads them to regard as necessary to social consideration. At this season, how many of us, after beginning our labours long before the sun dawns upon our city, find it difficult to snatch even this late hour (8 o'clock), at which we now assemble, from our pressing and yet unfulfilled business engagements! The same state of society exists in the United States of America, and the same effects ensue. Dr Caldwell, one of the ornaments of that country, in his work on Physical Education, introduces some excellent remarks on the tendency of the embroilment of party politics and religious differences to over-excite the brain and produce insanity, and also dyspepsia or indigestion, which, says he, is more nearly allied to insanity than is commonly supposed. "So true is this," he adds, "that the one is not unfrequently converted into the other, and often alternates with it. The lunatic is usually a dyspeptic during his lucid intervals; and complaints, which begin in some form of gastric derangement, turn, in many instances, to madness. Nor is this all. In families where mental derangement is hereditary, the members who escape that complaint are more than usually obnoxious to dyspepsia. It may be added, that dyspeptics and lunatics are relieved by the same modes of treatment, and that their maladies are induced, for the most part, by the same causes. The passions of grief, jealousy, anger, and envy, impair the digestive power; and dyspepsia is often cured by abandoning care and business, and giving rest to the brain. It is chiefly for this reason that a visit to a watering-place is so beneficial. The agitations of commercial speculation and too eager pursuit of wealth, have the same effect with party politics and religious controversy in over-exciting the brain; and "hence, in all probability, the inordinate extent of insanity and indigestion in Britain, and still more in the United States."

In opposition to these obvious dictates of reason, two objections are generally urged. The first is, that persons who are always taking care of their health, generally ruin it; their heads are filled with hypochondriacal fancies and alarms, and they become habitual valetudinarians. The answer to this remark is, that all such persons are already valetudinarians before they begin to experience the anxiety about their health here described; they are already nervous or dyspeptic, the victims of a morbid condition of body attended by uneasiness of mind, which last they ascribe to the state of their health. They are essentially in the right as to the main cause of their distress, for their mental anxiety certainly does proceed from disorder of their organic functions: Their chief error lies in this, that their efforts to regain health are not directed by knowledge, and in consequence lead to no beneficial result. They take quack medicines, or follow some foolish observances, instead of subjecting themselves patiently and perseveringly to a judicious regimen in diet, and regular exercise, accompanied by amusement, and relaxation,—the remedies dictated by the organic laws. This last procedure alone constitutes a proper care of health; and no one becomes an invalid, or a hypochondriac, from adopting it. On the contrary, many individuals, in consequence of this rational obedience to the organic laws, have ceased to suffer under the maladies which previously afflicted them.

The second objection is that many persons live in sound health to a good old age, who never take any care of themselves at all; whence it is inferred that

the safest plan is to follow their example and act on all occasions as impulse prompts, never doubting that our health, if we pursue this manly course, will take care of itself. In answer to this objection I observe, that constitutions differ widely in the amount of their native stamina, and consequently in the extent of tear and wear and bad treatment which they are able to sustain without being ruined; and that, for this reason, one individual may be comparatively little injured by a course of action which would prove fatal to another with a feebler natural frame.

The grand principle of the philosophy which I am now teaching is, that the natural laws really admit of no exceptions, and that specific causes, sufficient to account for the apparent exceptions, exist in every instance. Some of these individuals may have enjoyed very robust constitutions, which it was difficult to subvert: others may have indulged in excesses only at intervals, passing an intermediate period in abstinence, and permitting the powers of nature to re-adjust themselves and recover their tone, before they committed a new debauch; while others may have led an extremely active life, passing much of their time in the open air; a mode of being which enables the constitution to withstand a greater extent of intemperance than it can resist with sedentary employment. But of one and all of these men we may safely affirm, that if they had obeyed the organic laws, they would have lived still longer and more happily than they did by infringing them: and in the course of my observations, I have never seen an example of an individual who perseveringly proceeded in a course of intemperance, either sensual or mental,—that is, who habitually overtasked his stomach or his brain,—who did not permanently ruin his health, usefulness, and enjoyment: I, therefore, cannot believe in the supposed exceptions to the organic laws. On the contrary, I have seen many of the most robust and energetic boys, who were my school companions, sink into premature graves, from reckless reliance on their strength, and disregard of external injurious influences; while the more feeble, but more prudent, survive.

One source of error on this subject may be traced to the widely prevailing ignorance which exists regarding the structure and functions of the body; in consequence of which, danger is frequently present, unknown to those who unthinkingly expose themselves to its approach. If you have marked a party of young men, every one of whom is unacquainted with the currents, sand-banks, and rocks, visible and invisible, with which the Frith of Forth is studded, proceeding in a boat on a pleasure-sail, you may have seen them all alert, and full of fun and frolic; and if the day was calm and the sea smooth, you may have observed them return in the evening well and happy, and altogether unconscious of the dangers to which their ignorance had exposed them. They may repeat the experiment, and succeed, by a fortunate combination of circumstances, again and again; but how different would be the feelings of a prudent and experienced pilot, who knew every part of the channel, and who saw that on one day they had passed within three inches of a sunken rock, on which, if they had struck, their boat would have been smashed to pieces; on another, had escaped by a few yards a dangerous sandbank; and on a third, had with great difficulty been able to extricate themselves from a current which was rapidly carrying them on a precipitous and rocky shore. The pilot's anxiety would probably be fully justified at length, by the occurrence of one or other of those mischances, or by the upsetting of the boat in a squall, its destruction in a mist, or its driving out to sea when the wind aided an ebbing tide.

This is not an imaginary picture. In my own

youth, I happened to form one of such an inconsiderate party. The wind rose on us, and all our strength applied to the oars scarcely sufficed to enable us to pull round a point of rock, on which the sea was beating with so much force, that had we struck on it, our frail bark would never have withstood a second shock. Scarcely had we escaped this danger, when we ran right in the way of a heavy man of war's boat, scudding at the rate of ten miles an hour before the wind, and which would have run us down, but for the amazing promptitude of her crew, who in an instant extended twenty brawny arms over the side of their own boat, seized ours, and held it above water by main force, till they were able to clear away by our stern. The adventure was terminated by our being picked up by a revenue cutter, and brought safely into Leith harbour at a late hour in the evening. I have reflected since on the folly and presumptuous confidence of that excursion; but I never was aware of the full extent of the danger, until, many years subsequently, I saw a regular chart of the Frith, in which the shoals, sunken rocks, and currents were conspicuously laid down for the direction of pilots who navigate these waters.

Thus it is with rash, reckless, ignorant youth in regard to health. Each folly or indiscretion that, through some combination of fortunate circumstances, has been committed without immediate punishment, emboldens them to venture on greater irregularities, until, in an evil hour, they are caught in a violation of the organic laws that consigns them to the grave. Those who have become acquainted with the structure, functions, and laws of the vital organs, see the conduct of these blind adventurers on the ocean of life, in the same light that I regarded our youthful voyage after I had become acquainted with the chart of the Frith. There is an unspeakable difference between a belief in safety founded only on utter ignorance of the existence of danger, and that which arises from a knowledge of all the sunken rocks and eddies in the stream, and from a practical pilot's skill in steering clear of them all. The pilot is as gay and joyous as they; but his joy arises from well-grounded assurance of safety; theirs from ignorance of danger. He is cheerful, yet always observant, cautious, and alert. They are happy, because they are unobservant and heedless. When danger comes, he shuns it by his skill, or meets and conquers it. They escape it by accident, or perish unwittingly in the gulph.

The last observation which I make on this head is, that, in regard to health, Nature may be said to allow us to run with her an account-current, in which many small transgressions seem at the time to be followed by no penalty, when, in fact, they are all charged to the debit side of the account, and, after the lapse of years, are summed up and closed by a fearful balance against the transgressor. Do any of you know individuals, who, for twenty years, have persevered in frequent feasting, who all that time have been constant diners out or diners at home, or the soul of convivial meetings, prolonged into far advanced hours of the morning, and who have resisted every warning and admonition from friend, and proceeded in the confident belief that neither their health nor strength were impaired by such course? Nature kept an account-current with such men. She had at first placed a strong constitution and vigorous health to their credit, and they had drawn on it day by day; believing that, because she did not instantly strike the balance against them, and withdraw her blessing, she was keeping no note of their follies. But mark the close. At the end of twenty years, or less, you will find them dying of palsy, apoplexy, water in the chest, or some other disease clearly referrible to their protracted intem-

erance; or, if they escape death, you will see them come walking shadows, the ghosts of their former lives—the beacons, in short, set up by Nature to warn others that she does not, in any instance, permit her laws to be transgressed with impunity. If edulous instruction in the laws of health would not assist the reason and moral and religious feelings of such persons to curb their appetites, and avoid these consequences, they must be reckless indeed. At least, until this shall have been tried and failed, we should never despair, or consider their case and condition as beyond the reach of improvement.

It must be allowed, however, that the dangers arising to health from improper social habits and arrangements, cannot be altogether avoided by the exertions of individuals acting singly in their separate spheres. I shall have occasion, hereafter, in explaining the social law, to point out that the great precept of Christianity (that we must love our neighbours as ourselves) is inscribed in every line of our constitution; and that, in consequence, we must remember our neighbours as moral, intelligent, and virtuous as ourselves, and induce them to form a public opinion in favour of wisdom and virtue, before we can reap the full reward even of our own knowledge and attainments. As an example in point, I observe, that if there be among us any one merchant, manufacturer, or lawyer, who feels, in all its magnitude and intensity, the evil of an overstrained pursuit of wealth; yet he cannot, with impunity, abridge his hours of toil, unless he can induce his rivals to do so also. If they persevere, they will outstrip him in the race of competition, and impair his fortune. We must, therefore, produce a general conviction among the constituent members of society, that Providence forbids that course of incessant action which obstructs the path of moral and intellectual improvement, and leads to mental anxiety and corporeal suffering; and induce them, by a simultaneous movement, to apply an effectual remedy, in a wiser and better distribution of the hours of labour, relaxation, and enjoyment. Every one of us can testify, that this is possible, so far as the real, necessary, and advantageous business of the world is concerned; for we perceive that, by a judicious arrangement of our time and our affairs, all necessary business may be compressed within many fewer hours than those we now dedicate to that object. I should consider eight hours a-day amply sufficient for business and labour; there would remain eight hours more for enjoyment, and eight for repose; a distribution that would cause the current of life to flow more cheerfully, agreeably, and successfully, than it can do under our present system of ceaseless competition and toil.

It appears, then, from the foregoing considerations, that the study and observance of the laws of health is a moral duty, revealed by our constitution as the will of God, and, moreover, necessary to the due discharge of all our other duties. We rarely hear from divines an exposition of the duty of preserving health, founded on and enforced by an exposition of our natural constitution; because they confine themselves to what the Scriptures contain. The Scriptures, in prescribing sobriety and temperance, moderation and activity, clearly coincide with the natural laws on this subject; but we ought not to study the former to the exclusion of the latter; for, by learning the structure, functions, and relations of the human body, we are rendered more fully aware of the excellence of the Scriptural precepts, and we obtain new motives to observe them in our perpetuation of the punishments by which, even in this world, the breach of them is visited. Why the exposition of the will of God, when strikingly written in the Book of Nature, should be neglected by divines, is explicable only by the fact, that when the

present standards of theology were framed, that book was sealed, and its contents were unknown. We cannot, therefore, justly blame our ancestors for the omission; but it is not too much to hope that modern divines may take courage and supply the deficiency. I believe that many of them are inclined to do so, but are afraid of giving offence to the people. By teaching the people to regard all natural institutions as divine, this obstacle to improvement may, in time, be removed, and religion may be brought to lend her powerful aid in enforcing obedience to the natural laws.

In my Introductory Lecture, I explained that Veneration, as well as the other moral sentiments, is merely a blind feeling, and needs to be directed by knowledge. In that lecture, I alluded to the case of an English lady, who had all her life been taught to regard Christmas and Good-Friday as holy, and who, on her first arrival in Edinburgh, was greatly shocked at perceiving them to be desecrated by ordinary business. Her Veneration had been trained to regard them as sanctified days; and she could not immediately divest herself of pain at seeing them treated without any religious respect. I humbly propose, that, in a sound education, the sentiment of Veneration should be directed to all that God has really instituted. If the structure and functions of the body were taught to youth, as God's workmanship, and the duties deducible from them were clearly enforced as his commands, the mind would feel it to be sinful to neglect or violate them; and a great additional efficacy would thereby be given to all precepts, recommending exercise, cleanliness, and temperance. They would come home to youth, enforced by the perceptions of the understanding, and by the emotions of the moral sentiments; and they would be practically confirmed by the experience of pleasure from observance, and pain from infringement of them. The young, in short, would be taught to trace their duty to its foundation in the will of God, and to discover that it is addressed to them as rational beings: at the same time, they would learn that the study of his laws is no vain philosophy; for they would speedily discern the Creator's hand rewarding them for obedience, and punishing them for transgression.

As closely connected with health, I proceed to consider the subject of amusements, regarding which much difference of opinion prevails. When we have no true philosophy of mind, this question becomes altogether inextricable; because every individual disputant ascribes to human nature those tendencies, either to vice or virtue, which suit his favourite theory, and then he has no difficulty in proving that amusements either are, or are not, necessary and advantageous to a being so constituted. Phrenology gives us a firmer basis. As formerly remarked, man cannot make and unmake mental and bodily organs, nor vary their functions and laws of action to suit his different theories and views.

I observe, then, that every mental organ, by frequent and long continued action, becomes fatigued, just as the muscles of the leg and arm become weary by too protracted exertion. Indeed, it cannot be conceived that the mind, except in consequence of the interposition of organs, is susceptible of fatigue at all. We can comprehend that the vigour of the fibres of the organ of Tune may become exhausted by a constant repetition of the same kind of action, and demand repose; while the idea of an immaterial spirit becoming weary is altogether inconceivable.

From this law of our constitution, therefore, it is plain that variety of employment is necessary to our welfare, and was intended by the Creator. Hence he has given us a plurality of faculties, each having a separate organ, so that some may rest while others

are actively employed. Among these various faculties and organs, there are several which appear obviously destined to contribute to our amusement; a circumstance which (as Addison has remarked) "sufficiently shews us that Providence did not design this world should be filled with murmurs and repinings, or that the heart of man should be involved in gloom and melancholy." We have received a faculty of the ludicrous, which, when active, prompts us to laugh and to excite laughter in others: We have received organs of Tune and Time, which inspire us with the desire, and give us the talent, to produce music. Our organs of voluntary motion are so connected with these organs, that when we hear gay and vivacious music played in well marked time, we instinctively desire to dance; and when we survey the effect of dancing on our corporeal frame, we discover that it is admirably calculated to promote the circulation of the blood and nervous influence all over the body, and by this means to strengthen the limbs, the heart, the lungs, and the brain: in short, to invigorate the health, and to render the mind cheerful and alert. To such of my audience as have not studied anatomy and physiology, and who are ignorant of the functions of the brain, these propositions may appear to be mere words or theories; but to those who have made the structure, functions, relations, and adaptations of these various organs a subject of careful investigation, they will, I hope, appear in the light of truths. If such they are, our constitution proves that amusement has been kindly intended for us by the Creator, and that therefore, in itself, it must be not only harmless, but absolutely beneficial.

In this, as in every thing else, we must distinguish between the use and abuse of natural gifts. Because some young men neglect their graver duties through an excessive love of music, some parents denounce music altogether as dangerous and pernicious to youth; and because some young ladies think more earnestly about balls and operas than about their advancement in moral, intellectual, and religious attainments, there are parents who are equally disposed to proscribe dancing. But this is equally irrational as if they should propose to prohibit eating, because John or Helen had been guilty of a surfeit. These enjoyments in due season and degree are advantageous, and it is only sheer ignorance or impudence that can prompt any one to propose their abolition.

The organs of Intellect, combined with Secretiveness, Imitation, and Ideality, confer a talent for acting, or for representing by words, looks, gestures, and attitudes, the various emotions, passions, and ideas of the soul; and these representations excite the faculties of the spectators into activity in a powerful and pleasing manner. Farther, the Creator has bestowed on us organs of Constructiveness, Form, Size, Locality, and Colouring, which, combined with Imitation and Ideality, prompt us to represent objects in statuary or painting; and these representations also speak directly to the mind of the beholder, and fill it with delightful emotions. Here, then, we trace directly to nature the origin of the stage and of the fine arts. Again, I am forced to remark, that to those individuals who have not studied Phrenology and seen evidence of the existence and functions of the organs here enumerated, this reference of the fine arts, and of the drama in particular, to nature, or in other words to the intention of the Creator, will appear unwarranted, perhaps irreverent or impious. To such persons I reply, that, having satisfied myself by observation, that the organs do exist, and that they produce the effects here described, I cannot avoid the conclusion in question; and in support of it I may refer also to

the existence of the stage, and to the delight of mankind, in all ages and all civilized countries, in scenic representations.

If, therefore, the faculties which produce the love of the stage and the fine arts have been instituted by nature, we may justly infer that they have legitimate, improving, and exalting objects; although, like our other talents, they may be abused. The line of demarcation between their use and abuse may be distinguished by a moderate exercise of judgment. They are in themselves mere arts of expression and representation, a species of natural language, which may be made subservient to the gratification of all the faculties, whether propensities, moral sentiments, or intellect. We may represent in statuary, on canvass, or on the stage, lascivious and immoral objects calculated to excite all the lower feelings of our nature; which is a disgraceful abuse: or we may portray scenes and objects calculated to gratify and strengthen our moral, religious, and intellectual powers, and to carry forward our whole being in the paths of virtue and improvement; and this is the legitimate use of these gifts of God.

The applications made of these powers, by particular nations or individuals, bear reference to their general mental condition. The ancient Greeks and Romans enjoyed very immoral plays, and also combats of gladiators and of wild beasts, in which men and animals tore each other to pieces, and put each other to death. Such scenes were the direct stimulants of Amativeness, Combativeness, and Destructiveness, and proclaim to us, more forcibly than the pages of the most eloquent, veracious, and authentic historians, that these nations, with all their boasted refinement, were essentially barbarians, and that, in the mass of the people, the moral sentiments had not attained any important ascendancy. In the days of Queen Elizabeth and Charles the Second, plays of a very indelicate character were listened to by the nobles and common people of Britain, without the least expression of disapprobation: and this indicated a general grossness of feeling, and of manners, to be prevalent among them. Even in our own day we become spectators of plays of very imperfect morality and questionable delicacy; and the same conclusion follows, that there still lurks among us no small portion of unrefined animal propensity, and semi-barbarism; in other words, that the moral and intellectual faculties have not yet achieved the full conquest over our inferior nature. But even in these instances there is an evident advance from the Greek and Roman standards towards a more legitimate use of the faculties of representation; and I conclude from this fact, that future generations will apply them to still higher and more useful objects. Nor is it too enthusiastic to hope, that some future Shakspeare, aided by the true philosophy of mind, and a knowledge of the natural laws according to which good and evil are dispensed in the world, may teach and illustrate the philosophy of human life, with all the splendour of eloquence, and soul-stirring energy of conception which lofty genius can impart; and that a future Kemble or Siddons may proclaim such lessons in living speech and gestures to mankind. By looking forward to possibilities like these, we are enabled to form some notion of the legitimate objects for which a love of the stage was given, and of the improvement and delight of which it may yet be rendered the instrument.

If there be any truth in the principles on which these remarks are founded, we cannot avoid lamenting that helpless (although well meaning and amiable) imbecility, which, alarmed at the abuses of amusements, decries them altogether. A few days ago (Dec. 1835), we saw an announcement in the public papers that the ladies directresses of the House

of Industry of Edinburgh had declined to accept of money drawn at Mr Cook's circus for the benefit of that charity, because it was against their principles to countenance public amusements. If I am warranted in saying that the Creator has constituted our minds and bodies to be benefited by amusements—has given us faculties specially designed to produce and enjoy them—and has assigned a sphere of use and abuse to these faculties as well as to all others, it is clearly injudicious in the amiable, the virtuous, the charitable, and the religious,—in persons meriting our warmest sympathy and respect,—to place themselves in an attitude of hostility, and of open and indiscriminate denunciation, against pleasures founded on the laws of our common nature. Instead of bringing all the weight of their moral and intellectual character to bear upon the improvement and beneficial application of public entertainments, as it is obviously their duty both to God and to society to do, they fly from them as pestilential, and leave the direction of them exclusively to those whom they consider fitted only to abuse them. This is an example of piety and charity smitten with paralysis and fatal cowardice through ignorance. In urging you to “try all things,” and to distinguish between the uses and abuses of every gift, my aim is to impart to you *knowledge to distinguish virtue, and courage to maintain it*; to render you bold in advocating what is right, and to induce you, while there is a principle of reason and morality left to rest upon, never to abandon the field, whether of duty, instruction, or amusement, to those whom you consider the enemies of human happiness and virtue. Let us correct all our institutions, but not utterly extinguish any that are founded in nature.

LECTURE V.

ON THE DUTIES OF MAN AS A DOMESTIC BEING.

Origin of the domestic affections—Marriage, or connection for life between the sexes, is natural to man—Ages at which marriage is proper—Near relations in blood should not marry—Influence of the constitution of the parents on the children—Phrenology, as an index to natural dispositions, may be used as an important guide in forming matrimonial connections—Some means of discovering natural qualities prior to experience, is needed in forming such alliances, because after marriage experience comes too late.

The previous Lectures have been devoted to consideration of the duties incumbent on man as an individual;—those of acquiring knowledge and preserving health. My reason for thus limiting his individual duties is, that I consider man essentially as a social being; and that, with the exception of his duties to God, which we shall subsequently consider, he has no duties as an individual, beyond those I have mentioned, any more than a particular wheel of a watch has functions independently of performing its part in the general movements of the machine. I mean by this, that although man subsists and acts as an individual, yet that the great majority of his faculties bear reference to other beings as their objects, and shew that his leading sphere of life and action is in society. You could not conceive a bee, with its present instincts and powers of co-operation, to be happy, if it were established in utter loneliness, the sole occupant of an extensive heath or flower-bespangled meadow. In such a situation it might have food in abundance, and scope for such of its faculties as related only to itself; but its social instincts would be deprived of their objects and natural spheres of action. This observation is applicable

also to man. His faculties bear reference to other beings, and show that Nature has intended him to live and act in society. His duties as a member of the social body, therefore, come next under our consideration : and we shall first treat of his duties as a domestic being.

The domestic character of man is founded in, or arises from, the innate faculties of Amativeness, Philoprogenitiveness and Adhesiveness. These give him desires for a companion of a different sex, for children, and for the society of human beings in general. Marriage results from the combination of these three faculties* with the moral sentiments and intellect, and is thus a natural institution.

Some persons conceive that marriage, or union for life, is an institution only of ecclesiastical or civil law ; but this idea is erroneous. Where the organs above enumerated are adequately and equally possessed, and the moral and intellectual faculties predominate, union for life, or marriage, is a natural result. It prevailed among the ancient Greeks and Romans, and exists among the Chinese and many other nations who have not embraced either Judaism or Christianity. Indeed marriage, or living in society for life, is not peculiar to man. The fox, martin, wild cat, mole, eagle, sparrow-hawk, pigeon, swan, nightingale, sparrow, swallow, and other creatures, live united in pairs for life.† After the breeding season is past, they remain in union ; they make their expeditions together, and if they live in herds, the spouses remain always near each other.

It is true that certain individuals find the marriage tie a restraint, and would prefer that it should be abolished ; also that some tribes of savages may be found, among whom it can scarcely be said to exist. But if we examine the heads of such individuals, we shall find that Amativeness greatly predominates in size over Adhesiveness and the Moral Sentiments ; and men so constituted do not form the standards by which human nature should be estimated. Viewing marriages the result of man's constitution, we ascribe to it a divine origin. It is written in our minds ; and, like other divine institutions, it is supported by reward and punishment peculiar to itself. The reward attached to it, is enjoyment of some of the purest and sweetest pleasures of which our nature is susceptible ; and the punishment inflicted for inconstancy in it, is moral and physical degradation.

Among the duties incumbent on the human being in relation to marriage, one is, that the parties to it should not unite before a proper age. The civil law of Scotland allows females to marry at twelve, and males at fourteen ; but the law of nature is widely different. The female frame does not, in general, arrive at its full vigour and perfection, in this climate, earlier than twenty-two, nor the male earlier than from twenty-four to twenty-six. Before these ages, maturity of physical strength and of mental vigour is not, in general, attained ; and the individuals, with particular exceptions, are neither corporeally nor mentally prepared to become parents, or to discharge, with advantage, the duties of heads of a domestic establishment. Their corporeal frames are not yet sufficiently matured and consolidated : their animal propensities are strong ; and their moral and intellectual organs have not yet reached their full development. Children born of such parents are inferior in the size and quality of their brains, to children born of the same parents after they have arrived at maturity ; and from this defect, they are inferior in dispositions and capacity. It is a common remark, that the eldest son of a rich family

is generally not equal to his younger brothers in mental ability ; and this is ascribed to his having relied on his hereditary fortune for subsistence and social rank ; and to his consequent neglect of accomplishments and education ; but the cause is more deeply seated. In such instances, you will generally find that the parents, or one of them, have married in extreme youth, and that the eldest child inherits the imperfections of their immature condition.

The statement of the evidence and consequences of this law belongs to physiology : here I can only remark, that if nature has prescribed ages previous to which marriage cannot be undertaken with advantage, we are bound to pay deference to its enactments ; and that civil and ecclesiastical laws, when standing in opposition to them, are not only absurd but mischievous. Conscience is misled by these erroneous human statutes ; for a girl of fifteen has no idea that she sins, if her marriage be authorized by the law and the church. In spite, however, of the sanction of acts of Parliament, and of clerical benedictions, the Creator punishes severely if his laws be infringed. His punishments assume the following, among other forms :

The parties, being young, ignorant, inexperienced, and actuated chiefly by passion, often make unfortunate selections of partners, and entail lasting unhappiness on each other :

They transmit imperfect constitutions and inferior dispositions to their earliest born children : And

They often involve themselves in pecuniary difficulties, in consequence of a sufficient provision not having been made before marriage, to meet the expenses of a family.

These punishments indicate that a law of nature has been violated ; in other words, that marriage at too early an age is forbidden by the Author of our being.

There should not be a great disparity between the ages of the husband and wife. There is a physical and mental mode of being natural to each age ; whence persons whose organs correspond in their condition, sympathize in their feelings, judgments, and pursuits, and form suitable companions for each other. When the ages are widely different, not only is this sympathy wanting, but the offspring also is injured. In such instances it is generally the husband who transgresses ; old men are fond of marrying young women. The children of such unions often suffer grievously from the disparity. The late Dr Robert Macnish, in a letter addressed to me, gives the following illustration of this remark. " I know," says he, " an old gentleman, who has been twice married. The children of his first marriage are strong, active, healthy people, and their children are the same. The offspring of his second marriage are very inferior, especially in an intellectual point of view ; and the younger the children are, the more is this obvious. The girls are superior to the boys, both physically and intellectually. Indeed, their mother told me that she had great difficulty in rearing her sons, but none with her daughters. The gentleman himself, at the time of his second marriage, was upwards of sixty, and his wife about twenty-five. This shows very clearly that the boys have taken chiefly off the father and the daughters off the mother."

Another natural law in regard to marriage is, that the parties should not be related to each other in blood. This law holds good in the transmission of all organized beings. Even vegetables are deteriorated, if the same stock be repeatedly planted in the same ground. In the case of the lower animals, a continued disregard of this law is almost universally admitted to be detrimental, and human nature affords no exception to the rule. It is written in our organization, and the consequences of its infringement may

* Dr Vimont says that there is a special organ next to Philoprogenitiveness, giving a desire for union for life.

† Gall on the Functions of the Brain, vol. iii., p. 482.

be discovered in the degeneracy, physical and mental, of many noble and royal families, who have long and systematically set it at defiance. Kings of Portugal and Spain, for instance, occasionally apply to the Pope for permission to marry their nieces. The Pope grants the dispensation; the marriage is celebrated with all the solemnities of religion, and the blessing of heaven is invoked on the union. The real power of his Holiness, however, is here put to the test. He is successful in delivering the king from the censures of the church, and the offspring of the marriage from the civil consequences of illegitimacy; but Nature yields not one jot or tittle of her law. The union is either altogether unfruitful, or children miserably constituted in body, and imbecile in mind, are produced; and this is the form in which the Divine displeasure is announced. The Creator, however, is not recognised by his Holiness, nor by priests in general, nor by ignorant kings, as governing, by fixed laws, in the organic world. They proceed as if their own power were supreme. Even when they have tasted the bitter consequences of their folly, they are far from recognising the cause of their sufferings. With much self-complacency, they resign themselves to the event, and seek consolation in religion. "The Lord giveth," say they, "and the Lord taketh away; blessed be the name of the Lord;" as if the Lord did not give men understandings, and impose on them the obligation of using it to discover His laws and obey them; and as if there were no impiety in shutting their eyes against His laws, in acting in opposition to them, or, when they are undergoing the punishment of such transgressions, in appealing to him for consolation!

It is curious to observe the inconsistency of the enactments of legislators on this subject. According to the *Levitical* law, which we in this country have adopted, "marriage is prohibited between relations within three degrees of kindred, computing the generations through the common ancestor, and accounting affinity the same as consanguinity. Among the *Athenians*, brothers and sisters of the half-blood, if related by the father's side, might marry; if by the mother's side, they were prohibited from marrying. "The same custom," says Paley, "probably prevailed in *Chaldea*, for Sarah was Abraham's half-sister. 'She is the daughter of my father,' says Abraham, 'but not of my mother; and she became my wife.' Gen. xx. 12. The *Roman* law continued the prohibition without limits to the descendants of brothers or sisters."*

Here we observe Athenian, Chaldean, and Roman legislators prohibiting or permitting certain acts, apparently according to the degree of light which had penetrated into their own understandings concerning their natural consequences. The real Divine law is written in the structure and modes of action of our bodily and mental constitutions, and it prohibits the marriage of all blood-relations, diminishing the punishment, however, according as the remoteness from the common ancestor increases, but allowing marriages among relations by affinity, without any prohibition whatever. According to the law of Scotland, a man may marry his cousin-german, or his great niece, both of which connections the law of Nature declares to be inexpedient; but he may not marry his deceased wife's sister, against which connection Nature declares no penalty whatever. He might have married either sister at first without impropriety, and there is no reason in nature, why he may not marry them in succession, the one after the other has died. There may be other reasons of expediency for prohibiting this connection, but the organic laws do not condemn it.

In Scotland, the practice of full cousins marrying is not uncommon, and you will meet with examples of healthy families born of such unions; and from these an argument is maintained against the existence of the natural law which we are now considering. But it is only when the parents have both had excellent constitutions that the children do not attract attention by their imperfections. The first alliance against the natural laws brings down the tone of the organs and functions, say one degree; the second, two degrees, and the third three; and perseverance in transgression ends in glaring imperfections, or in extinction of the race. This is undeniable; and it proves the reality of the law. The children of healthy cousins are not so favourably organized as the children of the same parents, if married to equally healthy partners, not all related in blood, would have been. If the cousins have themselves inherited indifferent constitutions, the degeneracy is striking even in their children. Besides, I have seen the children of cousins continue healthy till the age of puberty, and then suffer from marked imperfections of constitution. Their good health in childhood was looked on by the parents as a proof that they had not in their union infringed any natural law, but the subsequent events proved a painful retribution for their conduct. We may err in interpreting Nature's laws; but if we do discover them in their full import and consequences, we never find exceptions to them.

Another natural law relative to marriage is, that the parties should possess sound constitutions. The punishment for neglecting this law is, that the transgressors suffer pain and misery in their own persons, from bad health, perhaps become disagreeable companions to each other, feel themselves unfit to discharge the duties of their condition, and transmit feeble constitutions to their children. They are also exposed to premature death; and hence their children are liable to all the melancholy consequences of being left unprotected and unguided by parental experience and affection, at a time when these are most needed. The natural law is, that a weak and imperfectly organized frame transmits one of a similar description to offspring; and, the children inheriting weakness, are prone to fall into disease and die. Indeed, the transmission of various diseases, founded in physical imperfections, from parents to children, is a matter of universal notoriety; thus, consumption, gout, scrofula, hydrocephalus, rheumatism, and insanity, are well known to descend from generation to generation. Strictly speaking, it is not disease which is transmitted, but organs of such imperfect structure that they are incapable of adequately performing their functions, and so weak that they are drawn into a morbid condition by causes which sound organs could easily resist.

This subject also belongs to physiology. I have treated of it in the Constitution of Man, and it is largely expounded by Dr A. Combe, in his works on Physiology and the Management of Infancy, and by many other authors. I trouble you only with the following illustrations, which were transmitted to me by Dr Macnish, who was induced to communicate them by a perusal of the Constitution of Man. "If your work," says he, "has no other effect than that of turning attention to the laws which regulate marriage and transmission of qualities, it will have done a vast service; for on no point are such grievous errors committed. I often see in my own practice, the most lamentable consequences resulting from neglect of these laws. There are certain families which I attend, where the constitutions of both parents are bad, and where, when any thing happens to the children, it is almost impossible to cure them. An inflamed gland, a common cold,

hange about them for months, and almost defies removal. In other families, where the parents are strong and healthy, the children are easily cured of almost any complaint. I know a gentleman, aged about fifty, the only survivor of a family of six sons and three daughters, all of whom, with the exception of himself, died young, of pulmonary consumption. He is a little man, with a narrow chest, and married a lady of a delicate constitution, and bad lungs. She is a tall, spare woman, with a chest still more deficient than his own. They have had a large family, all of whom die off regularly as they reach manhood and womanhood, in consequence of affections of the lungs. In the year 1833, two sons and a daughter died within a period of ten months. Two still survive, but they are both delicate, and there can be no doubt, that, as they arrive at maturity, they will follow the rest. This is a most striking instance of punishment under the organic laws.*

As to the transmission of mental qualities, I observe, that form, size, and quality of brain, descend, like those of other parts of the body, from parents to children: and that hence dispositions and talents, which depend upon the condition of the brain, are transmitted also—a fact which has long been remarked both by medical authors, and by observant men in general.

The qualities of the stock of each parent are apt to reappear in their children. If there be insanity in the family of the father or mother, although both of these may have escaped it, the disease, or some imperfection of brain allied to it, frequently reappears in one or more of their children. The great characteristic qualities of the stock, in like manner, are often reproduced in distant descendants.

While the father's constitution undoubtedly exerts an influence, the constitution of the mother seems to have much effect in determining the qualities of the children, particularly when she is a woman possessing a fine temperament, a well organized brain, and, in consequence, an energetic mind. There are few instances of men of distinguished vigour and activity of mind, whose mothers did not possess a considerable amount of the same endowments; and the fact of eminent men having so frequently children far inferior to themselves, is explicable by the circumstance, that men of talent often marry women whose minds are comparatively weak. When the mother's brain is very defective, the minds of the children are feeble. "We know," says the great German physiologist Haller, "a very remarkable instance of two noble females who got husbands on account of their wealth, although they were nearly idiots, and from which this mental defect has extended for a century into several families, so that some of all their descendants still continue idiots in the fourth and even the fifth generation."* In many families, the qualities of both father and mother are seen blended in the children. "In my own case," says a medical friend, "I can trace a very marked combination of the qualities of both parents. My father is a large-chested, strong, healthy man, with a large, but not active brain; my mother was a spare, thin woman, with a high nervous temperament, a rather delicate frame, and a mind of uncommon activity. Her brain I should suppose to have been of moderate size. I often think that to the father I am indebted for a strong frame and the enjoyment of excellent health, and to the mother for activity of mind, and excessive fondness for exertion." Finally, it often happens that the mental qualities of the father are transmitted to some of the children, and those of the mother to others.

It is pleasing to observe, that, in Würtemberg,

Baden, and some other German States, there are two excellent laws calculated to improve the moral and physical condition of the people. First, "It is illegal for any young man to marry before he is twenty-five, or any young woman before she is eighteen." Here the human legislator pays much more deference to the Divine Lawgiver, than he does in our country. Secondly, "A man, at whatever age he wishes to marry, must shew to the police and the priest of the commune where he resides, that he is able, and has the prospect, to provide for a wife and family." This also is extremely judicious.

It has been argued that these prohibitions only encourage immorality. During a residence in Germany, I observed, that where the individuals had average moral and intellectual organs, the law gave them the right direction, and produced the best effects. One of my own female servants was engaged to be married to a young man who was serving his three years as a soldier; and nothing could exceed the industry and economy which both practised, in order to raise the requisite funds to enable them to marry on his discharge. When the organs of the propensities predominated, there, as here, the parties rushed recklessly to indulgence. In this case, in Germany, the intercourse is illicit; in this country, it is often the same; or the substitute for it is an ill-assorted and miserable marriage. The German legislators, by giving their sanction to the dictates of reason and morality, at least discharge their own duty to their people; while our legislators lead us, by their authority, into error.

Another natural law in regard to marriage, is, that the mental qualities and the physical constitutions of the parties should be adapted to each other. If their dispositions, tastes, talents, and general habits harmonize, the reward is domestic felicity,—the greatest enjoyment of life. If these differ so widely as to cause jarring and collision, the home, which should be the palace of peace, and the mansion of the softest affections of our nature, becomes a theatre of war; and of all states of hostility, that between husband and wife is the most interminable and incurable, because the combatants live constantly together, have all things in common, and are continually exposed to the influence of each other's dispositions.

The importance of this law becomes more striking when we attend to the fact, that, by ill assortment, not only are the parties themselves rendered unhappy, but their immoral condition directly affects the dispositions of their children. It is a rule in nature, that the effects even of temporary departures from the organic laws, descend to offspring produced during that state, and injure their constitutions. Thus—children produced under the influence of inebriety, appear to receive an organization which renders them liable to a craving appetite for stimulating fluids. Children produced when the parents are depressed with misfortune, and suffering under severe nervous debility, are liable to be easily affected by events calculated to induce a similar condition; children produced when the parents are under the influence of violent passion, inherit a constitution that renders them liable to the same excitement: and hence, also, children produced when the parents are happy, and under the dominion of the higher sentiments and intellect, inherit qualities of body and brain that render them naturally disposed to corresponding states of mind. I have stated various facts and authorities in support of these views in the "Constitution of Man," to which I refer. These phenomena are the result of the transmission to the children of the mental organs modified in size, combination, and condition, by the temporary condition of the parents. This law is

* Elem. Physiol. Lib. xxix., Sec. 2, § 8.

subject to modifications from the influence of the hereditary qualities of the parents, but its real existence can hardly be doubted.

In my second Lecture, I laid down the principle, that man's first duty as an individual, is to acquire knowledge of himself, of external nature, and of the will of God; and I beg your attention to the application of this knowledge when acquired. If organic laws relative to marriage be really instituted by the Creator, and if reward and punishment be annexed to each of them, of what avail is it to know these facts abstractly, unless we know also the corresponding duties, and are disposed to perform them? We want such a knowledge of the human constitution as will carry home to the *understanding* and the *conscience*, the law of God written in our frames, and induce us to obey it. The sanction of public sentiment, religion, and civil enactments, are all necessary to enforce the observance of that law; and we need training also, to render obedience habitual.

Knowledge of the constitutions of individuals about to marry, can be attained only by the study of the structure, functions, and laws of the body. If anatomy and physiology, and their practical applications, formed branches of general education, we should be led to view this subject in all its importance, and, where our own skill was insufficient to direct us, we should call in higher experience. It is a general opinion, that all such knowledge will ever be useless, because marriage is determined by fancy, liking, passion, interest, or similar considerations, and never by reason. Phrenology enables us to judge of the force of this objection. It shows that the impulses to marry come from the instinctive and energetic action of the three organs of the domestic affections. These are large, and come into vigorous activity in youth, and frequently communicate such an influence to the other mental powers, as to enlist them all for the time in their service. The feelings inspired by these faculties, when acting impulsively and blindly, are dignified with various poetic names, such as fancy, affection, love, and so forth. Their influence is captivating, and not a little mysterious; which quality adds much to their charms with young minds. But Phrenology, without robbing them of one jot of their real fascinations, dispels the mystery and illusions, and shews them to us as three strong impulses, which will act either conformably to reason, or without its guidance, according as the understanding and moral sentiments are enlightened or left in the dark. It shews us, moreover, disappointment and misery, in various forms, and at different stages of life, as the natural consequences of defective guidance; while happiness of the most enduring and exalted description, is the result of the wise and just direction of them.

Believing, as I do, that the Creator has constituted man a rational being, I am prepared to maintain that the very converse of the objection under consideration is true—namely, that average men, if *adequately instructed and trained*, could not avoid giving effect to the natural laws in forming marriages. I say average men; because Phrenology shews to us that some human beings are born with animal organs so large, and moral and intellectual organs so small, that they are the slaves of the propensities, and proof against the dictates of reason. These individuals, however, are not numerous, and are not average specimens of the race. If, before the organs of the domestic affections come into full activity, the youth of both sexes were instructed in the laws of the Creator relative to marriage, and if the sanctions of religion, and the opinion of society were added to enforce the fulfilment of them, it is

not to be presumed that the propensities would still hurry average men to act in disregard of all these guides. This assumption would imply that man is *not* rational, and that the Creator has laid down laws for him which he is incapable, under any natural guidance, of obeying;—a proposition which to me is incredible.

I have introduced these remarks, to prepare the way for the observation, that before the discovery of Phrenology, it was impossible to ascertain the mental dispositions and capacities of individuals prior to experience of them in actions, and that there was, on this account, great difficulty in selecting, on sound principles, partners really adapted to each other, and calculated to render each other happy in marriage. I know that a smile is sometimes excited when it is said that Phrenology confers the power of acting rationally, in this respect, on individuals who could not be certain of doing so without its aid; but a fact does not yield to a smile.

Not only is there nothing irrational in the idea that Phrenology may give the power of obtaining the requisite knowledge; but, on the contrary, there would be a glaring defect in the moral government of the world, if the Creator had not provided means by which human beings could ascertain, with reasonable accuracy, the mental dispositions and qualities of each other, before entering into marriage. He has prompted them, by the most powerful and fascinating of impulses, to form that connection. He has withheld from them discriminating instincts, to enable them always to choose right; and yet he has attached tremendous penalties to their errors in selection. If He have not provided some means, suited to the rational nature of man, to enable him to guide his impulses to proper objects, I cannot conceive how his government can be reconciled to our notions of benevolence and justice. We must believe that He punishes us for not doing what He has denied us the capacity and the means of accomplishing.

No method of discovering, prior to experience, the natural dispositions of human beings, has hitherto been practically available. The general intercourse of society, such as is permitted to young persons of different sexes before marriage, reveals, in the most imperfect manner, the real character; and hence the bitter mortification and lasting misery in which some prudent and anxious persons find themselves involved, after the blandishments of a first love have passed away, and when the inherent qualities of the minds of their partners begin to display themselves without disguise and restraint. The very fact that human affection continues in this most unhappy and unsuccessful condition, should lead us to the inference that there is some great truth relative to our mental constitution undiscovered, in which a remedy for these evils will be found. The fact that a man is a rational creature—who must open up his own way to happiness—ought to lead us, when misery is found to result from our conduct, to infer that we have been erring, through lack of knowledge, and to desire better as well as more abundant information.

So far from its being incredible, therefore, that a method has been provided by the Creator, whereby the mental qualities of human beings may be discovered, this supposition appears to be directly warranted by every fact which we perceive, and every result which we experience, connected with the government of the world. If God *has* placed within our reach the means of avoiding unhappy marriages, and if we neglect to avail ourselves of his gift, then we are ourselves to blame for the evils we endure. I cannot too frequently remind you, that every fact,

physical and moral, with which we are acquainted, tends to shew that man is comparatively a recent inhabitant of this globe; that, as a race, he is yet in his infancy; and that we have no more reason to be astonished at new and valuable natural institutions, calculated to promote human enjoyment and virtue, evolving themselves from day to day to our understandings, than we have to wonder at the increasing intelligence of an individual as he passes from childhood to youth, and from youth to manhood.

I am equally at a loss to discover any reason why it should be absurd, that the means of discriminating natural qualities should be presented to us through the medium of the brain. Dr Thomas Brown has justly remarked, that "to those who have not sufficient elementary knowledge of science, to feel any interest in physical truths, as one connected system, and no habitual desire of exploring the various relations of new phenomena, many of the facts in nature, which have an appearance of incongruity as at first stated, do truly seem ludicrous;" but the impressions of such minds constitute no criterion of what is really wise or unwise in nature.

It has been ascertained by measurement that a head not more than thirteen inches in horizontal circumference is invariably attended by idiocy, unless the frontal region be disproportionately large. Dr Voison, of Paris, lately made observations on the idiots under his care at the Hospital of Incurables in that city, and found this fact uniformly confirmed, and also that, *ceteris paribus*, the larger the head was, the more vigorously were the mental powers manifested.

It is worthy of remark, that—almost as if to shew an intention that we should be guided by observation of the size and configuration of the brain—the cerebral development in man is extensively indicated during life by the external aspect of the head; while in the lower animals this is much less decidedly the case. In the hog, elephant, and others, the form and magnitude of the brain are not at all discoverable from the living head. The brutes have no need of that knowledge of each other's dispositions which is required by man: instincts implanted by nature lead them into the proper path; and, as it is presumable that a different arrangement has not been adopted in regard to man without an object and a reason, subsequent generations may contemplate Phrenology with different eyes from those with which it has been regarded in our day.

To illustrate the possibility of discriminating natural dispositions and talents by means of observations on the head, I may be permitted to allude to the following cases. On the 28th October 1835, I visited the jail at Newcastle, along with Dr George Fife (who is not a phrenologist) and nine other gentlemen, and the procedure adopted was this: I examined the head of an individual criminal, and, before any account of him whatever was given, wrote down my own remarks. At the other side of the table, and at the same time, Dr Fife wrote down an account of the character and conduct of the same individual, as disclosed by the judicial proceedings and the experience of the jailor. When both writings were finished, they were compared.

"The first prisoner was a young man about 20 years of age, P. S. After stating the organs which predominated and those which were deficient in his brain, I wrote as follows:—'My inference is, that this boy is not accused of violence; his dispositions are not ferocious, nor cruel, nor violent; he has a talent for deception, and a desire for property not regulated by justice. His desires may have appeared in swindling or theft. It is most probable that he has swindled; he has the combination which contri-

butes to the talent of an actor.' The remarks which Dr Fife wrote were the following:—'A confirmed thief; he has been twice convicted of theft. He has never shewn brutality, but he has no sense of honesty. He has frequently attempted to impose on Dr Fife; he has considerable intellectual talent; he has attended school, and is quick and apt; he has a talent for imitation.'

"The next criminal was also a young man, aged 18, T. S. I wrote:—'This boy is considerably different from the last. He is more violent in his dispositions; he has probably been committed for an assault connected with women. He has also large Secretiveness and Acquisitiveness, and may have stolen, although I think this less probable. He has fair intellectual talents, and is an improvable subject.' Dr Fife wrote:—'Crime, rape. * * * No striking features in his general character; mild disposition; has never shewn actual vice.'

"The third criminal examined was an old man of 73, J. W. The remarks which I wrote were these:—'His moral dispositions generally are very defective, but he has much caution. I cannot specify the precise crime of which he has been convicted. Great deficiency in the moral organs is the characteristic feature, which leaves the lower propensities to act without control.' Dr Fife wrote:—'A thief; void of every principle of honesty; obstinate; insolent; ungrateful for any kindness. In short, one of the most depraved characters with which I have ever been acquainted.' * * * Many examples of accurate description of natural dispositions and talents from examining the head, by other phrenologists, are on record, and before the public.

The two young men here described were rather well-looking and intelligent in their features, and if judged of simply by their appearance, would have been believed to be rather above than below the average youth of their own rank of life. Yet which of you will say, that if any relative of yours were to be addressed by men of the same dispositions, it would not be more advantageous to possess the means of discovering their real qualities before marriage, and consequently of avoiding them, than to learn them only by experience; in other words, after having become their victim?

I add another illustration. Upwards of ten years ago, I had a short interview with an individual who was about to be married to a lady with whom I was acquainted. In writing this piece of news to a friend at a distance, I described the gentleman's development of brain, and dispositions; and expressed my regret that the lady had not made a more fortunate choice. My opinion was at variance with the estimate of the lover made by the lady's friends from their own knowledge of him. He was respectably connected, reputed rich, and regarded as altogether a desirable match. The marriage took place. Time wheeled in its ceaseless course; and at the end of about seven years, circumstances occurred of the most painful nature, which recalled my letter to the memory of the gentleman to whom it had been addressed. He had preserved it, and after comparing it with the subsequent occurrences, he told me that the description of the natural dispositions coincided so perfectly with those which the events had developed, that it might have been supposed to have been written after they had happened.

I cannot here enter into the limitations and conditions under which Phrenology should be used for this purpose; such discussions belong to the general subject of that science. My sole aim is to announce the possibility of its being thus applied. If you will ask any lady who suffers under the daily calamity of

a weak, ill-tempered, or incorrigibly rude and vulgar husband, and who, by studying Phrenology, sees these imperfections written in legible characters in his brain, whether she considers that it would have been folly to have observed and given effect to these indications in avoiding marriage, her sinking and aching heart will answer, no! She will pity the flippancy that would despise any counsel of prudence, or treat with inattention any means of avoiding so great an evil, and declare that, had she known the real character indicated by the head, she could not have consented to become the companion of such a man for life. In fact, we find that sensible men and women, in forming matrimonial alliances, do, in general, avail themselves of the best information which they can obtain as a guide to their conduct; they avoid glaring bodily defects, and openly bad characters; and this is a complete recognition of the principle for which I am contending. The whole extravagance of which I am now guilty (if any of you consider it as such) consists in proposing to put you in possession of the means of obtaining more minute, accurate, and serviceable knowledge, than, in ordinary circumstances, you can, otherwise, attain. I am willing, therefore, to encounter all the ridicule which may be excited by these suggestions, convinced that those will laugh best who win, and that attention to them will render all winners, if they be founded, as I believe them to be, in the institutions of nature.

I stand before you in a singular predicament. Lecturers on recognised science are hailed with rapturous encouragement, when they bring forward new truths; and in proportion as these are practical and important, the higher is their reward. I appear, however, as the humble advocate of a science which is still so far from being universally admitted to be true, that the very idea of applying it practically in a department of human life, in which, hitherto, there has been no guide, appears to many to be ludicrous. It would be far more agreeable to me to devote my efforts to teaching you doctrines which you should all applaud, and which should carry home to your minds a feeling of respect for the judgment of your instructor. But one obstacle prevents me from enjoying this advantage. I have been permitted to become acquainted with a great, and, lately, an unknown region of truth, which appears to my own mind to bear the strongest impress of a divine origin, and to be fraught with the greatest advantages to mankind; and, as formerly stated, I feel it to be a positive moral duty to submit it to your consideration. All I ask is, that you will receive the communication with the spirit and independence of free-minded men. Open your eyes that you may see, your ears that you may hear, and your understandings that you may comprehend; and fear nothing.

LECTURE VI.

ON POLYGAMY: FIDELITY TO THE MARRIAGE VOW: DIVORCE: DUTIES OF PARENTS TO THEIR CHILDREN.

Polygamy not founded in nature—Fidelity to the marriage vow a natural institution—Divorce—Objections to the law of England on this subject—Circumstances in which divorce should be allowed—Duties of parents—Mr Malthus' law of population, and Mr Sadler's objections to it, considered—Parents bound to provide for their children, and to preserve their health—Consequences of neglecting the laws of health.

The remarks in my last Lecture related to the constitution of marriage. Moralists, generally, dis-

cuss also the questions of polygamy, fidelity to the marriage vow, and divorce.

On the subject of polygamy, I may remark. that it is pretty well ascertained by statistical researches that the proportions of the sexes born, are thirteen males to twelve females. From the greater hazards to which the male sex is exposed, this disparity is reduced, in adult life, to equality; indeed, in almost all Europe, owing to the injurious habits, and pursuits of the men, the balance among adults is turned the other way, the females of any given age above puberty preponderating over the males. In some Eastern countries more females are born than males; and it is said that this indicates a design in nature, that *there* each male should have several wives. But there is reason to believe that the variation from the proportion of thirteen to twelve is the consequence of vicious habits in the males. In the appendix to the "Constitution of Man," I have quoted some curious observations in regard to the determination of the sexes, in the lower animals; from which it appears that inequality is the result of unequal strength and age in the parents. In our own country and race, it is observed, that when old men marry young females, the progeny are generally daughters; and I infer that, in the Eastern countries alluded to, in which an excess of females exists, the cause may be found in the superior vigour and youth of the females; the practice of polygamy being confined to rich men, who enervate themselves by disobedience to the natural laws, and become, by that means, physically inferior to the females.

The equality of the sexes, therefore, when the organic laws are duly observed, affords one strong indication, that polygamy is not a natural institution; and this conclusion is strengthened by considering the objects of the domestic affections. Harmonious gratification of the three faculties constituting the domestic group, in accordance with the moral sentiments and intellect, is attended with the greatest amount of pure enjoyment, and the most advantageous results; but this can be attained only by the union of one male with one female. If the male have several wives, there is an excess of gratification provided for the cerebellum, and a diminution of gratification to Adhesiveness and Philoprogenitiveness; for his attachment, diffused among a multitude of objects, can never glow with the intensity, nor act with the softness and purity, which inspire it when directed to one wife and her offspring. The females also, in a state of polygamy, must be deprived of gratification to their Self-Esteem and Adhesiveness, for none of them can claim an undivided love. There is injustice to the females, therefore, in the practice; and no institution that is unjust can proceed from nature. Farther, when we consider that in married life the pleasures derived from the domestic affections are unspeakably enhanced by the habitual play of the moral feelings, and that polygamy is fatal to the close sympathy, confidence, respect, and reciprocal devotion, which are the attendants of active moral sentiments,—we shall be fully convinced that the Creator has not intended that men should unite themselves to a plurality of wives.

Regarding fidelity. Every argument tending to shew that polygamy is forbidden by the natural law, goes to support the obligation of fidelity to the marriage vow. As this point is one on which, fortunately, no difficulty or difference of opinion, among rational persons, exists, I shall not dwell on it, but proceed to the subject of divorce.

The law of England does not permit divorce in any circumstances, or for any causes. In that country, a special act of the legislature must be obtained to annul a marriage, which rule of course limits the privilege to the rich; and we may, therefore, fairly

say that the law denies divorce to the great majority of the people. The law of Scotland permits divorce on account of infidelity to the marriage vow; of non-adherence, or wilful desertion, as it is called, by the husband, of his wife's society for a period of four successive years; and of personal imbecility. The law of Moses permitted the Jewish husband to put away his wife; and under Napoleon, the French law permitted married persons to dissolve their marriage by consent, after giving one year's judicial notice of their intention, and making suitable provisions for their children. The New Testament confines divorce to the single case of infidelity in the wife.

The question now occurs—What does the law of nature, written in our constitutions, enact?

The first fact that presents itself to our consideration, is, that in persons of well-constituted minds, Nature not only institutes marriage, but makes it indissoluble, except by death: even those lower animals which live in pairs, exemplify permanent connection. In regard to man, I remark, that where the three organs of the domestic affections bear a just proportion to each other, and where the moral and intellectual organs are favourably developed and cultivated, there is not only no desire, on either side, to bring the marriage tie to an end, but the utmost repugnance to do so. The deep despondency which changes, into one unbroken expression of grief and desolation, the whole aspect even of the most determined and energetic men, when they lose by death the cherished partners of their lives; and that breaking down of the spirit, profoundly felt, although meekly and resignedly borne, which the widow indicates when her stay and delight is removed from her for ever;—proclaim, in language too touching and forcible to be misunderstood, that where the marriage union is formed according to Nature's laws, no civil enactments are needed to render it indissoluble during life. It is clear that life-endurance is stamped upon it by the Creator, when He renders its continuance so sweet, and its bursting asunder so indescribably painful. It is only where the minds of the parties are ill-constituted, or the union is otherwise unfortunate, that desire for separation exists. The causes which may lead married individuals to wish to terminate their union, may be briefly considered.

1. If, in either of them, the cerebellum predominates greatly in size over Adhesiveness, Philoprogenitiveness, and the organs of the moral sentiments, there is a feeling of restraint in the married state, which is painful.

To compel a virtuous and amiable partner to live in inseparable society with a person thus constituted, and to be the unwilling medium of transmitting immoral dispositions to children, appears directly contrary to the dictates of both benevolence and justice. Paley's argument against permitting dissolution of the marriage tie at the will of the husband, is, that "new objects of desire would be continually sought after, if men could, at will, be released from their subsisting engagements. Supposing the husband to have once preferred his wife to all other women, the duration of this preference cannot be trusted to. Possession makes a great difference; and there is no other security against the invitations of novelty, than the known impossibility of obtaining the object." This argument is good, when applied to men with unfavourably balanced brains, viz. to those in whom the cerebellum predominates over the organs of Adhesiveness and the moral sentiments; but it is unfounded as a general rule; and the question is, whether it be desirable to deny absolutely, to the great body of the people, as the law of England does, all available means of dissolving the connection with such beings. It appears not to be so. The husband,

certainly, should not have the power to dissolve the marriage tie at his pleasure; but the French law seems more reasonable which permitted the parties to dissolve the marriage when both of them, after twelve months' deliberation, and after suitably providing for their children, desired to bring it to a close.

The same argument applies to the voluntary dissolution of marriage in cases of irreconcilable differences in temper and dispositions. "The law of nature," says Paley, "admits of divorce in favour of the injured party, in cases of adultery, of obstinate desertion, of attempts upon life, of outrageous cruelty, of incurable madness, and, perhaps, of personal imbecility; but by no means indulges the same privileges to mere dislike, to opposition of humours, and inclination, to contrariety of taste and temper, to complaints of coldness, neglect, severity, peevishness, jealousy: not that these reasons are trivial, but because such objections may always be alleged, and are impossible by testimony to be ascertained; so that to allow implicit credit to them, and to dissolve marriages whenever either party thought fit to pretend them, would lead in its effects to all the licentiousness of arbitrary divorces."—"If a married pair, in actual and irreconcilable discord, complain that their happiness would be better consulted, by permitting them to determine a connection which is become odious to both, it may be told them, that the same permission, as a general rule, would produce libertinism, dissension, and misery among thousands, who are now virtuous, and quiet, and happy in their condition; and it ought to satisfy them to reflect that, when their happiness is sacrificed to the operation of an unrelenting rule, it is sacrificed to the happiness of the community."

If there be any truth in Phrenology, this argument is a grand fallacy. Actual and irreconcilable discord arises from want of harmony in the natural dispositions of the parties, connected with differences in their cerebral organizations; and agreement arises from the existence of such harmony. The natures of the parties in the one case differ irreconcilably; but to maintain that if two persons of such discordant minds were permitted to separate, thousands of accordant minds would instantly fly asunder, is as illogical as it would be to assert that, if the humane spectators of a street fight were to separate the combatants, they would forthwith be seized with the mania of fighting among themselves.

In point of fact, the common arguments on this subject have been written in ignorance of the real elements of human nature, and are applicable only to particularly constituted individuals. Married persons may be divided into three classes: First, those whose dispositions naturally accord, and who, consequently, are happy; secondly, those in whom there are some feelings in harmony, but many in discord, and who are in the medium state between happiness and misery; and, thirdly, those between whose dispositions there are irreconcilable differences, and who are, in consequence, altogether unhappy in each other's society.

Paley's views, if applied to persons who are bordering on the middle line of like and dislike towards each other, would be sound. To hold up to such persons extreme difficulty or impossibility in obtaining a dissolution of the marriage tie, will present them with motives to cultivate those feelings in which they agree; while to offer them easy means of terminating it, might lead to a reckless aggravation of their quarrels. But this is only one class, and their case does not exhaust the question. Where the union is really accordant in nature, the facility of undoing it will not alter its character, nor produce the desire to destroy the happiness which it en-

genders. Where it is irremediably unsuitable and unhappy, the sacrifice of the parties will not mend their own condition; and as the happy are safe in the attractions of a reciprocal affection, the only persons who can be said to be benefited by the example of the inseparability of the wretched, are the class of waverers to whom I have alluded. I humbly think that Nature has attached not a few penalties to the dissolution of the marriage tie, which may have some effect on this class; and that these, aided by proper legal impediments to the fulfilment of their caprices, might render the restraints on them sufficient, without calling for the absolute sacrifice of their completely unhappy brethren for the supposed public good.

Such a conclusion is greatly strengthened by the consideration that the dispositions of children are determined, in an important degree, by the predominant dispositions of the parents; and that to prevent the separation of wretched couples, is to entail misery on the offspring, not only by the influence of example, but by the transmission of ill-constituted brains—which is the natural result of the organs of the lower feelings being maintained, by dissension, in a state of constant activity in their parents.

The argument that an indissoluble tie presents motives to the exercise of grave reflection before marriage, might be worthy of some consideration, if persons contemplating that state possessed adequate means of rendering reflection successful; but while the law permits matrimonial unions at ages when the parties are destitute of foresight (in Scotland, in males at 14, and in females at 12), and while the system of moral and intellectual education pursued in this country furnishes scarcely one sound element of information to guide the judgment in its choice, the argument is a mockery at once of reason and of human suffering. It appears to me, that until mankind shall be instructed in the views which I am now advocating (in so far as experience shall prove them to be sound), and shall be trained to venerate them as institutions of nature, and to practise them in their conduct, they will not possess adequate means of acting rationally and successfully in forming marriages. While sources of error encompass them on every side, they ought not to be deprived of the possibility of escaping from the pit into which they may have inadvertently fallen; and not only divorce for infidelity to the marriage vow, but dissolution of marriage by voluntary consent, under proper restrictions, and after due deliberation, should be permitted.*

Having now considered the general subject of marriage, I proceed to make some remarks on the duties of parents to their children.

Their first duty is to transmit sound constitutions, bodily and mental, to their offspring; and this can be done only by their possessing sound constitutions themselves, and living in habitual observance of the natural laws. Having already treated of this duty in discussing the constitution of marriage, I shall

not here revert to it. It is of high importance; because, if great defects be inherent in children at birth, a life of suffering is entailed on them: The iniquities of the fathers are truly visited on the children, to the third or fourth generation, of those who hate God by disobeying his commandments written in their frames. The empirical condition of medical science is one great cause of the neglect of the organic laws in marriage. Not only do medical men generally abstain from warning ill-constituted individuals against marrying, but many of them deliberately form unions themselves, which, on well ascertained physiological principles, cannot fail to transmit feebleness, disease, and suffering to their own children. It is sufficient here to disapprove of the selfishness of those who, for their own gratification, knowingly bring into the world beings by whom life cannot fail to be regarded as a burden.

In the next place, parents are bound by the laws of nature to support, educate, and provide for the welfare and happiness of their children. The foundation of this duty is laid in the constitution of the mind. Philoprogenitiveness, acting along with Benevolence, gives the impulse to its performance, and Veneration and Conscientiousness invest it with all the sanctions of moral and religious obligation. When these faculties are adequately possessed, there is in parents a strong and never slumbering desire to promote the real advantage of their offspring; and in such cases, only intellectual enlightenment and pecuniary resources are wanting to ensure its complete fulfilment. Neglect of, or indifference to, this duty, is the consequence of deficiency either in Philoprogenitiveness, in the moral organs, or in both; and the conduct of individuals thus unfavourably constituted, should not be charged against human nature as a general fault.

The views of Mr Malthus on population may be adverted to in connexion with the duty of parents to support their families. Stated simply, they are these:—The productive powers of healthy, well fed, well lodged, and well clothed human beings, are naturally so great, that fully two children will be born for every person who will die within a given time; and as a generation lasts about 30 years, at the end of that period the population will of course be doubled:—In point of fact, in the circumstances here enumerated, population is observed actually to double itself in 25 years. This rate of increase takes place in the newly settled and healthy states of North America, independently of immigration. To become aware of the effects which this power of increase would produce in a country of circumscribed territory, like Great Britain, we need resort only to a very simple calculation. If, for example, Britain in 1800 had contained 12 millions of inhabitants, and this rate of increase had taken place, the population in 1825 would have amounted to 24 millions; in 1850 it would amount to 48 millions; in 1875 to 96 millions; in 1900 to 192 millions; and in 1925 to 384 millions; and so on, always doubling every 25 years. Now Malthus maintained that food cannot be made to increase in the same proportion; we cannot extend the surface of Britain, for nature has fixed its limits; and no skill or labour will suffice to augment the productive powers of the soil in a ratio doubling every 25 years. As the same power of increase exists in other countries, similar observations are applicable to them. He, therefore, drew the conclusion, that human beings (in the absence of adequate means of emigration, and of procuring food from foreign countries) should restrain their productive powers, by the exercise of their moral and intellectual faculties; in other words, should not marry until they are in possession of sufficient means to maintain and educate a family; and he added,

* The revised statutes of Massachusetts (chapter 76, sect. 5) permit divorce "for adultery, or defect in either party, or when either of them is sentenced to confinement to hard labour in the state-prison, or in any jail or house of correction, for the term of life, or for seven years or more; and no pardon granted to the party so sentenced, after a divorce for that cause, shall restore the party to his or her conjugal rights." This last is a just and humane provision; for it is calculated for the relief of the innocent partner of a confirmed criminal. When will the law of England contain a similar enactment? The class which makes the laws in Britain is not that which supplies criminals to jails or penal colonies, and it is often long before the mere dictates of humanity and justice prompt them to remove an inferior order from an evil, the pressure of which is not experienced by themselves.

that if this rule were generally infringed, and the practice of marrying early and exerting the powers of reproduction to their full extent became common, in a densely peopled country, Providence would check the increase by premature deaths, resulting from misery and starvation.

This doctrine has been loudly declaimed against; but its merits may be easily analyzed. The domestic affections are powerful, and come early into play, apparently to afford a complete guarantee against extinction of the race; but along with them, we have received moral sentiments and intellect, bestowed for the evident purpose of guiding and restraining them, so as to lead them to their best and most permanent enjoyments. Now, what authority is there from nature, for maintaining that these affections alone are entitled to emancipation from moral restraint and intellectual guidance; and that they have a right to pursue their own gratification from the first moment of their energetic existence to the last, if only the marriage vow shall have been taken and observed? I see no foundation in reason for this view. From the imperfections of our moral education, we have been led to believe, that if a priest solemnize a marriage; and the vow of fidelity be observed, there is no sin, although there may be imprudence or misfortune, in rearing a family for whom we are unable to provide. But if we believe in the natural laws, as institutions of the Creator, we shall be satisfied that there is great sin in such conduct. "We know that nature has given us strong desires for property, and has fired us with ambition, the love of splendour, and other powerful longings; yet no rational person argues that these desires may, with propriety, be gratified when we have not the means of legitimately doing so; or that any ecclesiastical ceremony or dispensation can then render such gratification allowable. Why, then, should the domestic affections form an exception to the universal rule of moral guidance and restraint?"

Mr Sadler, a writer on this subject, argues, that marriages naturally become less prolific as the population becomes more dense, and that in this way the consequences predicted by Malthus are prevented. But this is trifling with the question; for the very misery of which Malthus speaks, is the cause of the diminished rate of increase. This diminution may be owing either to fewer children being born, or to more dying early, in a densely than in a thinly peopled country or district. The causes why fewer children are born in densely peopled countries are easily traced; some parents, finding subsistence difficult of attainment, practise moral restraint and marry late; others who neglect this precaution are, by the competition inseparable from that condition, oppressed with cares and troubles, whereby the fruitfulness of marriage is diminished—but these are instances of misery attending on a dense state of population. Again, it is certain that in such circumstances the mortality of children is greater; but this also is the result of the confined dwellings, imperfect nutrition, depressed energies, and care and anxiety which, through competition, afflict many parents in that social condition. If the opposition of Malthus could shew that there is a law of nature by which the productiveness of marriage is diminished in proportion to the density of the population, *without an increase of misery*, they would completely refute his doctrine. This, however, they cannot do. A healthy couple, who marry at a proper age, and live in comfort and plenty, are able to rear as numerous and vigorous a family in the county of Edinburgh, which is densely peopled, as in the thinly inhabited county of Ross. Mr Malthus, therefore, does well in bringing the domestic affections,

equally with our other faculties, under the control of the moral and intellectual powers.

A reflected light of the intentions of nature in regard to man, may frequently be obtained by observing the lower animals. Almost all the lower creatures have received powers of increasing their numbers far beyond the voids made by death in the form of natural decay. If we consider the enormous numbers of sheep, cattle, fowls, hares, and other creatures, in the prime of life, that are annually slaughtered for human sustenance, and recollect that the stock of those existing is never diminished, we shall perceive that if every one of these animals which is produced were allowed to live and propagate, in a very few years a general desolation, through scarcity of food, would overtake them all. It is intended that these creatures should be put to death, and used as food. Now man, in so far as he is an organized being, closely resembles these creatures, and in the instincts in question he is constituted exactly as they are. But he has obtained the gift of reason, and instead of being intended to be thinned by the knife and violence, like the animals, he is invited to increase his means of subsistence by his skill and industry, and to restrain his domestic affections by his higher powers of morality and reflection, whenever he reaches the limits of his food. As the mental organs may be enlarged or diminished in the course of generations by habitual exercise or restraint, it is probable that, in a densely peopled and highly cultivated nation, the organs of the domestic affections may diminish in size and activity, and that a less painful effort may then suffice to restrain them than is at present necessary, when the world is obviously young, and capable of containing vastly more inhabitants than it yet possesses.

The next duty of parents is, to preserve the life and health of their children after birth, and to place them in circumstances calculated to develop favourably their physical and mental powers. It is painful to contemplate the extent to which human ignorance and wickedness cause this duty to be neglected. "A hundred years ago," says Dr A. Combe, "when the pauper infants of London were received and brought up in the workhouses, amidst impure air, crowding, and want of proper food, not above one in twenty-four lived to be a year old; so that out of 2900 annually received into them, 2690 died. But when the conditions of health came to be a little better understood, and an act of Parliament was obtained obliging the parish officers to send the infants to nurse in the country, this frightful mortality was reduced to 450, instead of 2600!" In 1781, when the Dublin Lying-in Hospital was imperfectly ventilated, "every sixth child died within nine days after birth, of convulsive disease; and after means of thorough ventilation had been adopted, the mortality of infants, within the same time, in five succeeding years, was reduced to nearly one in twenty." Even under private and maternal care, the mortality of infants is extraordinary. "It appears from the London bills of mortality, that between a fourth and a fifth of all the infants baptized die within the first two years of their existence. This extraordinary result is not a part of the Creator's designs; it does not occur in the case of the lower animals, and must therefore have causes capable of removal."* It is the punishment of gross ignorance and neglect of the organic laws. Before birth, the infant lives in a temperature of 98, being that of the mother: at birth it is suddenly ushered into the atmosphere of a cold climate; and among the poorer classes through want, and among the richer through ignorance or inattention,

* Physiology applied to Health and Education.

It is often left very inadequately protected against the effects of this sudden change. In the earlier stages of infancy, improper food, imperfect ventilation, deficient cleanliness, and want of general attention, consign many to the grave; while in childhood and youth, great mischief to health and life are often occasioned by direct infringements of the organic laws. In a family which I knew well, two sons, of promising constitutions, had slept during the years of youth in a very small bed-closet, with a window consisting of a single pane of glass, which was so near to the bed that it could never be opened with safety to their lungs during the night. Breathing the atmosphere of so small an apartment, for seven or eight hours in succession, directly tended to bring down the vigour of their respiratory organs, and to injure the tone of their whole systems. The effect of this practice was to prepare the lungs to yield to the first unfavourable influence to which they might be exposed; and accordingly, when such occurred, both fell victims to pulmonary disease. Similar cases are abundant; and the ignorance which is the root of the evil is the more fatal, because the erroneous practices which undermine the constitution operate slowly and insidiously, and even after the results are seen, their causes are neither known nor suspected. For many years, a lady known to me was troubled with frequent and severe headaches, which she was unable to get rid of; but having been instructed in the functions of the lungs, the constitution of the atmosphere, and the bad effects of improper food and a sedentary life, she removed from a very confined bed-room which she had long occupied, to one that was large and airy,—she took regular exercise in the open air, and practised discrimination with respect to her food; and after these precautions, her general health became good, and headaches seldom annoyed her. This improvement lasted for upwards of ten years, when a severe domestic calamity overtook her; brought back the disordered action of the stomach and head, and consigned her at last to a premature grave.

When you study this subject with a view to practice, you will find that the principles which I laid down in the fourth Lecture, are of great importance as guides—namely, that each organ of the body has received a definite constitution, and that health is the result of the harmonious and favourable action of the whole. Hence, it is not sufficient to provide merely airy bed-rooms for children, if at the same time the means of cleanliness be neglected, or their brains be over-exerted in attending too many classes, and learning too many tasks:—The delicate brain of youth demands frequent repose. In short, a practical knowledge of the laws of the human constitution is highly conducive to the successful rearing of children; and the heart-rending desolation of parents, when they see the dearest objects of their affections successively torn from them by death, should be viewed as the chastisement of ignorance or negligence alone, and not as proofs of the world being constituted unfavourably for the production of human enjoyment. In this matter, however, parents should not look to *their own* happiness merely; they are under solemn obligations to the children whom they bring into the world. Improper treatment in infancy and childhood, at which period the body grows rapidly, is productive of effects far more prejudicial and permanent than at any subsequent age;* and assuredly those parents are not guiltless who wilfully keep themselves in ignorance of the

organic laws, or, knowing these, refrain from acting in accordance with them in the rearing of their children. The latter have a positive claim (which no parent of right feeling will disregard or deny) on those who have brought them into existence, that they shall do all in their power to render it agreeable.

Perhaps some may think that the importance of obedience to the organic laws has been insisted on more than the subject required. Such an idea is natural enough, considering that an exposition of these laws forms no part of ordinary education, and that obedience to them is enjoined by no human authority. There is no trace of them in the statute-book, none in the catechisms issued by authority of the Church; and you rarely, if ever, hear them mentioned as laws of God, by his servants who teach his will from the pulpit. Nay, even the general tongue of society, which allows few subjects to escape remark, is silent with regard to them. Hence, it is probable that the importance of obeying the organic laws may to some appear to be over-estimated in these lectures. But the universal silence which prevails in society has its source in ignorance. Physiology is still unknown to nineteen-twentieths even of educated persons, and to the mass it is a complete *terra incognita*. Even by medical men it is little studied as a practical science, and the idea of its beneficial application as a guide to human conduct in general, is only now beginning to engage their attention. If to all this we add, that until Phrenology was discovered, the dependence of mental talents and dispositions on cerebral development was scarcely even suspected,—and that belief in this truth is still far from being universal,—the silence which prevails with respect to the organic laws, and neglect of them in practice, will not seem unaccountable.

On this subject I would observe, that there is a vast difference between the uncertain and the unascertained. It is now universally admitted, that all the movements of matter are regulated; and that they are never uncertain, although the laws which they observe may, in some instances, be unascertained. The revolutions of the planets can be predicted, while those of some of the comets are still unknown; but no philosopher imagines that the latter are uncertain. The minutest drop of water that descends the mighty fall of Niagara, is regulated in all its movements by definite laws, whether it rise in mist and float in the atmosphere to distant regions, there to descend as rain; or be absorbed by a neighbouring shrub, and reappear as an atom in a blossom adorning the Canadian shore; or be drunk up by a living creature, and mingle with its blood; or become a portion of an oak, which at a future time shall career on the ocean. Nothing can be less ascertained, or probably less ascertainable by mortal study, than the revolutions of such an atom; but every philosopher, without a moment's hesitation, will concede that not one of them is uncertain.* The first element of a philosophic understanding, is the capacity of extending the same conviction to the events evolved in every department of nature. A man who sees disease occurring in youth or middle age, and whose mind is not capable of perceiving that it is the result of imperfect or excessive action in some vital organ, and that imperfect or excessive action is just another name for deviation from the proper healthy state of that organ, is not capable of reasoning. It may be true that, in many instances, our knowledge is so imperfect, that we are unable to discover the chain of connection between the dis-

* The principles which should guide parents in the treatment of children are stated and enforced in Dr A. Combe's work on the *Physiological and Moral Treatment of Infancy*.

* I owe this forcible illustration to Dr Chalmers, having first heard it in one of his lectures.

case and its organic cause; but, nevertheless, he is no philosopher, who doubts that such a connection exists, and that the discovery of it is presented as an important practical problem to the human understanding to solve.

One cause of the obscurity that prevails on this subject in the minds of persons not medically educated, is ignorance of the structure and functions of the body; and another is, that diseases appear under two very distinct forms—structural and functional; only the former of which is considered by common observers to constitute a proper malady. If an arrow be shot into the eye there is derangement of structure, and the most determined opponent of the natural laws will at once admit the connection between the blindness which ensues, and the lesion of the organ. But if a watchmaker or an optical instrument-maker, by long-continued and excessive exertion of the eye, have become blind, the disease is called functional; because the function, from being over-stimulated, is impaired; but frequently no alteration of structure can be perceived. No philosophic physiologist, however, doubts that there is, in the structure, a change corresponding to the functional derangement, although human observation cannot detect it. He never says that it is nonsense to assert that the patient has become blind in consequence of infringement of the organic laws. It is one of these laws that the function of the eye shall be exercised moderately, and it is a breach of that law to strain it to excess.

The same principle applies to a great number of diseases occurring under the organic laws. Imperfections in the tone, structure, or proportions of certain organs, may exist at birth, so hidden by their situation, or so slight, as not to be readily perceptible, but not on that account the less real and important; or deviations may be made gradually and imperceptibly from the proper and healthy standards of exercise; and from one or other of these causes, disease may invade the constitution. Religious persons term disease occurring in this manner a dispensation of God's providence; the careless name it an unaccountable event; but the philosophic physician invariably views it as the result of imperfect or excessive action of some organ or another, and he never doubts that it has been caused by deviations from the laws of the animal economy. The objection that the doctrine of the organic laws which I have been inculcating is unsound, because diseases come and go, without uneducated persons being able to trace their causes, has not a shadow of philosophy to support it. I may err in my exposition of these laws, but I hope I do not err in stating that neither disease nor death, in early or middle life, can take place under the ordinary administrations of Providence, except when these laws have been infringed.

My reason for insisting so largely on this subject, is a profound conviction of the importance of the organic laws. They are fundamental to happiness; that is, the consequences of errors in regard to them cannot be compensated for or removed by any other means than obedience. I daily see melancholy results of inattention to their dictates. When you observe the husband, in youth or middle age, removed by death from the partner of his love, and the other dear objects of his affections; or when you see the mother at a similar age torn from her infant children, her heart bleeding at the thought of leaving them in the hand of the stranger while they most need her maternal care; the cause of the calamity is either that the dying parent inherited a defective constitution in consequence of disobedience by his ancestors to the organic laws, or that he himself has infringed them grievously.

Again, if we see the lovely infant snatched from the mother's bosom by the hand of death, while it caused every affection of her mind to thrill with joy, and fed her hopes with the fondest and brightest visions of its future talent, virtue and happiness,—let us trace the cause, and we shall find that the organic laws have been infringed. If you see an aged man walking with heavy step, and deeply dejected mein, the nearest follower after a bier adorned with white,—it is a father carrying to the grave his first-born son, the hope and stay of his life, torn from him in the full bloom of manhood, when already he had eased the hoary head of half its load of care. The cause of this scene also is infringement of the organic laws.

Or open the door of some family parlour, where we expect to meet with peace and joy, blessing and endearment, as the natural accompaniments of domestic life, and see discord, passion, disappointment, and every feeling that embitters existence, depicted on the countenances of the inmates. The cause is still infringement of the organic laws. Two persons have married whose brains differ so widely, that there is not only no natural sympathy between them, but absolute contradiction in their dispositions. This discord might have been read in their brains before they were united for life.

Look on still another scene. You may observe several persons of each sex, in middle life, gravely sitting in anxious deliberation. They are the respectable members of a numerous family, holding consultation on the measures to be adopted in consequence of one of their number having become insane, or having given himself up irreclaimably to drunkenness, or to some worse species of immorality. Their feelings are deeply wounded, their understandings are perplexed, and they know not what to do. The cause is still the same: the unfortunate object of their solicitude has inherited an ill-constituted brain; it has yielded to some exciting cause, and he has lost his reason; or he has given way to a headlong appetite for intoxicating liquors, in consequence of one or other of his parents, or some one of their stock, having laboured under a similar influence; and it has now become an actual disease. The organic laws have been infringed; and this scene also is the form in which the Creator indicates to his creatures that his laws have been transgressed. If you make a catalogue of human miseries, and inquire how many of them spring directly or indirectly from infringement of the organic laws, you will be astonished at its extent.

If, therefore, we desire to diminish this class of calamities, we must study and obey the organic laws. As these laws operate independently of all others, we may manifest the piety of angels, and yet suffer if we neglect them. If there be any remedy on earth for this class of evils, it is obedience to the laws of our constitution, and this alone. If, then, these laws be fundamental,—if the consequences of disobeying them be so formidable, and if escape be so impossible, you will forgive the anxiety with which I have endeavoured to expound them.

I might draw pictures the converse of all that I have here represented, and shew you health, long life, happiness, and prosperity, as the rewards of obeying these and the other natural laws, and I should still be justified by philosophy; but the principle, if admitted, will carry home these counter results to your own understandings. I beg permission farther to remark, that all philosophy and theology which have been propounded by men ignorant of these laws, may be expected to be imperfect; and that, therefore, we arrogate no undue superiority in refusing to yield the convictions of our own judgments to the dictates of such guides, who had not sufficient data on

which to found their opinions. The events of human life, viewed through the medium of their principles, and of the philosophy which I am now expounding, must appear in very different lights. In their eyes many events appear inscrutable, which to us are clear. According to our view, an all-wise and beneficent Creator has bestowed on us, the highest of his terrestrial creatures, the gift of reason, and has arranged the whole world as a theatre for its exercise. He has placed before us examples without number, of his power, wisdom, and goodness; prescribed laws to us in external nature, and in our own constitutions; and left us to apply our faculties to study and act in harmony with them, and then to live and be happy; or to neglect them and to suffer. Each of you will approve of that system which appears to be founded in truth, and to tend most to the glory of God. I ask no man to yield his conscience and his understanding to my opinions; but only solicit liberty to announce what to myself appears to be true, that it may be received or rejected according to its merits.

In concluding, it is proper to add one observation. Mankind have lived so long without becoming acquainted with the organic laws, and have, in consequence, so extensively transgressed them, that there are few individuals in civilized society, who do not bear in their persons, to a greater or less extent, imperfections derived from this source. It is impossible, therefore, even for the most anxious disciples of the new doctrine, all at once to yield perfect obedience to these laws. If none were to marry in whose family stock, and in whose individual person, any traces of serious departures from the organic laws were to be found, the civilized world would become a desert. The return to obedience must be gradual, and the accomplishment of it the result of time. After these laws are unfolded to a man's discernment, he is not guiltless if he disregard them, and commit flagrant violations of their dictates. We are all bound, if we believe them to be instituted by God, to obey them as far as is in our power; but we cannot command all external circumstances. We are bound to do the best we can; and this, although not all that could be desired, is often much; nor shall we ever miss an adequate reward, even for our imperfect obedience.

It is deeply mysterious, that man should have been so formed as to err for thousands of years through ignorance of his own constitution and the laws under which he suffers or enjoys; but it is equally mysterious that the globe itself underwent the successive revolutions revealed by geology, destroying myriads of living creatures, and extinguishing whole races of beings before it attained its present state! It is equally mysterious, also, why the earth presents such striking inequalities of soil and climate—in some regions so beautiful, so delightful, so prolific: in others so dreary, sterile, and depressing! It is equally mysterious that men have been created mortal creatures, living, even at the best, but for a season on the earth, and then yielding their places to successors, whose tenures will be as brief as their own. These are mysteries which reason cannot penetrate, and for which fancy cannot account; but they all relate, not to our conduct here, but to the will of God in the creation of the universe. Although we cannot unravel the counsels of the Omnipotent, this is no reason why we should not study and obey his laws. What he has presented to us we are bound to accept with gratitude at his hand, as a gift; but in using it, we are called on to exercise our reason, the noblest of his boons; and we may rest assured that no impenetrable darkness will hang over the path of our duty, when we shall have fairly opened our eyes and our understandings to

the study of his works. There is no difficulty in believing that man, having received reason, was intended to use it,—that, by neglecting to do so, he has suffered evils,—and that, when he shall duly employ it, his miseries will diminish; and this is all that I am now teaching. It may be inexplicable why we should not earlier have gone into the road that leads to happiness; but let us not hesitate to enter it now, if we see it fairly open before us.

LECTURE VII.

It is the duty of parents to educate their children—To be able to discharge this duty, parents themselves must be educated—Deficiency of education in Scotland—Means of supplying the deficiency—It is a duty to provide for children—Best provision for children consists in a sound constitution, good moral and intellectual training, and instruction in useful knowledge—What distribution of the parents' fortune should be made?—Rights of parents and duties of children—Obedience to parents—Parents bound to render themselves worthy of respect—Some children born with defective moral and intellectual organs—How they should be treated.

Next to the duty of providing for the physical health and enjoyment of their children, parents are bound to train and educate them properly, so as to fit them for the discharge of the duties of life. The grounds of this obligation are obvious. The human body and mind consist of a large assemblage of organs and faculties, each possessing native energy and an extensive sphere of action, and capable of being used or abused, according as it is directed. The extensive range of these powers, a prime element in the dignity of man, renders education exceedingly important. As parents are the authors and guardians of beings thus endowed, it is clearly their duty to train their faculties, and to direct them to their proper objects. "To send an uneducated child into the world," says Paley, "is little better than to turn out a mad dog, or a wild beast into the streets."

To conduct education properly, it is necessary to know the physical and mental constitution of the being to be educated, and also the world in which he is to be an actor. Generally speaking, the former knowledge is not possessed, and the latter object is very little regarded. How many parents are able to call up, even in their own minds, any satisfactory view of the mental faculties (with their objects and spheres of action) which they aim at training in their children? How many add to this knowledge an acquaintance with the physical constitution of the human being, and of the kind of treatment which is best calculated to develop favourably its energies and capabilities? Nay, who can point out even a body of professional teachers who are thus highly accomplished? I fear few of us can do so.

I do not blame either parents or teachers for the present imperfect state of their knowledge; because they themselves were not taught; indeed, the information here described did not exist a few years ago, and it exists but to a very limited extent still. Ignorance, therefore, is our misfortune, rather than our fault; and my sole object in adverting to its magnitude is to present us with motives to remove it. While it continues so profound and extensive as it has hitherto generally been, sound and salutary education can no more be accomplished than you can cause light to shine forth out of darkness. Scotland has long boasted of her superior education; but her eyes are now opening to the groundlessness of this pretension. In Mar 1835, Dr Welsh, in the General

Assembly, told the nation that Protestant Germany, and even some parts of Catholic Germany, are, in that respect, far before us. The public mind is becoming so much alive to our deficiencies, that better prospects open up for the future. The details of education cannot be here entered into; but it may be remarked, that Phrenology points out the necessity of training the propensities and sentiments, as well as cultivating and instructing the understandings of children. For accomplishing these ends, Infant Schools on Mr Wilderspin's plan are admirably adapted.

The objects of education are—to strengthen the faculties that are too weak, to restrain those which are too vigorous, to store the intellect with moral, religious, scientific, and general knowledge, and to direct all to their proper objects. In cultivating the intellect, we should bear in view that external nature is as directly adapted to our different intellectual powers as light is to the eye; and that the whole economy of our constitution is arranged on the principle that we shall study the qualities and relations of external objects, apply them to our use, and also adapt our conduct to their operation. The three great means of education are domestic training, public schools, and literature or books. The first will be improved by instructing parents; the second by the diffusion of knowledge among the people at large; while the third is now—through the efforts of those philanthropists who have given birth to really cheap moral and scientific literature (particularly Messrs Chambers of Edinburgh)—placed within the reach of every class of the community.

Messrs Chambers have lately added to their other means of instruction, a series of cheap books on education, in which the lights of modern knowledge are brought together to illuminate, and render practical, this interesting subject. Europe is, at this moment, only waking out of the slumbers of the dark ages; she is beginning to discover that she is ignorant, and to desire instruction. The sun of knowledge, however, is still below the horizon to vast multitudes of our British population; but they are startled by a bright effulgence darting from a radiant sky, and they now know that that light is the dawn of a glorious day, which will tend to terminate their troubled dreams of ignorance and folly. Let us help to arouse them—let us lead them to pay their morning orisons in the great temple of universal truth. When they shall have entered into that temple, let us introduce them to nature and to nature's God; and let us hasten the hour when the whole human race shall join together, to celebrate His power, wisdom, and goodness, in strains which will never cease till creation pass away; for we know that the sun of knowledge (unlike the orb of day), when once risen, will never set, but will continue to emit brighter and brighter rays, till time shall be no more. In eternity, alone, can we conceive the wonders of creation to be completely unfolded, and the mind of man to be satiated with the fullness of information.

In the present course of Lectures I am treating merely of *duties*; and when I point out to you the foundation and extent of the duty of educating your children, it is all that I can accomplish. I cannot here discuss the *manner* in which you may best discharge this obligation. This instruction can be obtained only by a thorough education of your own minds; and the courses of lectures provided by the Philosophical Association are admirable auxiliaries to the attainment of this end. After you have become acquainted with Anatomy and Physiology as the keys to the physical constitution of man; with Phrenology as the development of his mental constitution; with Chemistry, Natural History, and

Natural Philosophy, as expositions of the external world and with Political Economy and Moral Philosophy as the sciences of human action; you will be in possession of the rudimentary or elementary knowledge necessary to enable you to comprehend and profit by a course of lectures on practical education, which is really the application of this knowledge to the most important of all purposes, that of training the body to health, and the mind to virtue, intelligence, and happiness. I hope that the directors of this Association will hereafter induce some qualified lecturer to undertake such a course, but I beg leave to express my humble conviction, that no error is more preposterous than that which leads many persons to suppose that, *without this preliminary or elementary knowledge*, parents can be taught how to educate their children successfully.

The process of education consists in training faculties, and communicating knowledge; and it appears to me to be about as hopeless a task to attempt to perform this duty by mere rules and directions, as it was for the Israelites to make bricks in Egypt without straw. I am the more anxious to insist on this point, because no error is more common in the practical walks of life, than the belief that a parent can learn how to educate a child without undergoing the labour of educating himself. Many parents of both sexes, but particularly mothers, have told me, that if I would lecture on Education, they would come and hear me; because they considered the education of their children to be a duty, and were disposed to sacrifice the time necessary for obtaining instruction how to discharge it. When I recommended to them to begin by studying Physiology, Chemistry, Natural Philosophy, and Phrenology, at least to such an extent as to be able to comprehend the nature of the body and mind which they proposed to train, and the objects by which the mind and body are surrounded, and on which education is intended to enable them to act,—they instantly declared that they had no time for these extensive inquiries, and that information about education was what they wanted, as it alone was necessary to their object. I told them, in vain, that these were preliminary steps to any available knowledge of education. They were so ignorant of mind and of its faculties and relations, that they could not conceive this to be the case, and refused to attend these courses of instruction.

If I could succeed in persuading you of the truth of this view, the permanence of this association, and the success of its lectures, would be secured; because the industrious citizens of Edinburgh would prize it as a grand means of preparing their own minds for the important duty of educating their children, and would no longer come hither merely to be amused, or to pass an idle hour; they would regard every science taught by this association, as a step towards the attainment of the most important object of human life—that of training the young to health, intelligence, virtue, and enjoyment.*

The next duty of parents is to provide suitably for the outfit of their children in the world. If I am right in the fundamental principle, that happiness consists in well regulated activity of the various functions of the body and mind, and that the world is designedly arranged by the Creator with a view to the maintenance of our powers in this condition of activity,—it follows that a parent who shall have provided a good constitution for his child, preserved him in sound health, thoroughly educated him, trained him to some useful calling, and supported him until

* The Lectures of the Philosophical Association, after being interrupted for several years, were resumed in the winter 1843-6.

he shall have become capable of exercising it,—will have discharged the duty of maintenance in its highest and best sense.

It is of much importance to children to give them correct views of the real principles, machinery, and objects of life, and to train them to act systematically in relation to them, in their habitual conduct. What should we think of a merchant who should embark himself, his wife, family, and fortune, on board of a ship; take the command of it himself, and set sail on a voyage of adventure, without knowledge of navigation, without charts, and without having any particular port of destination in view? We should consider him as a lunatic: And yet many men are launched forth on the sea of active life, as ill provided with knowledge and objects, as the individual here imagined. Suppose, however, our adventurous navigator to use the precaution of placing himself under convoy, to attach himself to a fleet, to sail when they sailed, and to stop when they stopped, we should still lament his ignorance, and reckon the probabilities great of his running foul of his companions in the voyage, foundering in a storm, being wrecked on shoals or sunken rocks, or making an unproductive speculation, even if he safely attained a trading port. This simile appears to me to be scarcely an exaggeration of the condition in which young men in general embark in the business of the world. The great mass of society is the fleet to which they attach themselves; it is moving onwards, and they move with it; sometimes it is favoured with prosperity, sometimes overtaken by adversity, and they passively undergo its various fates; sometimes they make shipwreck of themselves by running foul of their neighbours' interests, or by deviating from the course, and encountering hazards peculiarly their own; but in all they do, and in all they suffer, they obey an impulse from without, and rarely pursue any definite object, except the acquisition of wealth, and they follow even it, without a systematic plan. If you consider that this moving mass called society is only a vast assemblage of individuals, nearly all equally ignorant, and that the impulses which they obey, are merely the desires of the most energetic minds, pursuing, often blindly, their individual advantage, you cannot be surprised at the strange gyrations which society has so often exhibited. In rude ages, the leaders and the people loved "the pride, pomp, and circumstance of glorious war," they moved to the sound of the trumpet, and rejoiced in the clang of arms. In our day, the leaders steer to wealth and fame, and the mass toils after them as best it may. In one year a cotton mania seizes the leaders, and vast portions of the people are infected with the disease. In another year, a mania for joint-stock companies attacks them, and their followers again catch the infection. In a third year, a fever for railroads seizes on them, and all rush into speculations in stock. In these varying aspects of social movements, we discover nothing like a well-considered scheme of action, adopted from knowledge, and pursued to its results. The leaders and the multitude appear equally to be moved by impulses which control and correct each other by collision and concussion, but in each of which thousands of individuals are crushed to death, although the mass escapes and continues to move forward in that course which corresponds to the direction of the last force which was applied to it.

It appears to me, that, by correct and enlarged knowledge of human nature, and of the external world, the young might be furnished with a chart and plan of life, suited to their wants, desires, and capacities, as rational beings. If they should subsequently become leaders, this would enable them to steer the social course with greater precision and advan-

tage than has been done in bygone times: or, if they remained humble members of the body-politic, to shape their individual courses, so as in some degree to avoid the collisions and concussions which reckless ardour, in alliance with ignorance, is ever encountering. A young man, if properly instructed, should commence active life with a clear perception of the natural laws by which social interests, and particularly those of the profession which he adopts, are governed; the results to which the various courses of action submitted to his choice are calculated to lead; and the steps by which these results are in general evolved. This advantage, however, is rarely possessed, and the young are left to grope their way, or to join the convoy and sail with the fleet, as they best are able.

Under the present system of impulsive and imitative action, one or other of two errors generally infects the youthful mind. If the parents of a family have long struggled with pecuniary difficulties, and the depression of poverty, but ultimately, after much exertion and painful self-denial, have attained to easy circumstances,—they teach their children almost to worship wealth; and at the same time fill their minds with vivid ideas of laborious exertions, sacrifices, difficulties, cares, and troubles, as almost the only occurrences of life. They represent expense and enjoyment as closely allied with sin; and young persons thus trained, if they possess well-constituted brains, often become rich, but rarely reap any reasonable satisfaction from their earthly existence. They plod, and toil, and save, and invest; they are often religious, on the principle of laying up treasures in heaven; but cultivate neither their moral nor their intellectual faculties; and at the close of life complain that all is vanity and vexation of spirit.

The second error is diametrically the opposite of this one. Parents of easy, careless dispositions, who have either inherited wealth, or been successful in business without much exertion, generally teach their children the art of enjoying life without that of acquiring the means of doing so; and such children enter into trade or engage in professions under the settled conviction (not conveyed by their parents, perhaps, in direct terms, but insensibly instilled into their minds by example), that the paths of life are all level, clear, and smooth; that they need only to put the machinery of business into motion; and that, thereafter, all will go smoothly forward, affording them funds and leisure for enjoyment, with little anxiety, and very moderate exertion. Young persons thus instructed, if they do not possess uncommonly large organs of Caution and Conscientiousness, go gaily on in active life for a brief space of time, and then become the victims of a false system, and of inexperience. They are ruined, and suffer countless privations. The errors of both these modes of training the young should be avoided.

After health, education, and virtuous habits, the best provision that a parent can make for his son, is to furnish him with sound views of his real situation as a member of the social body. The Creator having destined man to live in society, the social world is so arranged that an individual, illuminated by a knowledge of the laws which regulate social prosperity, by dedicating himself to a useful pursuit, and fulfilling ably the duties connected with it, will meet with very nearly as certain a reward, in the means of subsistence and enjoyment, as if he raised his food directly from the soil. Astonishing stability and regularity are discoverable in the social world, when its constitution and laws of action are understood. If legislators would cease to protect what they call national, but which are really class interests, and would leave the business world free to its spontaneous movements, enforcing by law only the obser-

ance of justice,—the labourer, artisan, manufacturer, and professional practitioner, would find the demands for their labour, goods, or other contributions to the social welfare, to follow with so much constancy and regularity, that, with ability, attention, and morality on the part of each, they would very rarely indeed be left unprovided for. It is of great importance to press home this truth on the minds of the young, and to open their understandings to a perception of the causes which operate in producing this result, that they may enter into active life with a just reliance on the wisdom and goodness of the Creator, in providing the means of subsistence and enjoyment for all who discharge their social duties; and yet with a feeling of the necessity of knowledge, and of the practice of that moral discipline which enforces activity and good conduct at every step, as the natural and indispensable conditions of success.

In our own country, the duty of teaching sound and practical views of the nature of man as an individual, and of the laws which regulate his social condition, to the young, has become doubly urgent since the passing of the Reform Act. Under the previous system of government, only the wealthy were allowed to exercise the political franchise; and as education was a pretty general concomitant of wealth,—power and knowledge (so far as knowledge existed) were to a great degree united in the same hands. Now, however, when great property is no longer indispensable to the exercise of political influence, it is necessary to extend and improve general education. The middle classes of this country have in their own hands the power of returning a majority of the House of Commons; and as the Commons hold the strings of the national purse, and, when nearly unanimous, exercise an irresistible influence in the state, it is obvious that those who elect them ought to be educated and rational men.

In past ages, government has been conducted too often on short-sighted empirical principles, and rarely on the basis of a sound and comprehensive philosophy of man's nature and wants: hence the wars undertaken for futile and immoral purposes; hence the heavy taxes which oppress industry and obstruct prosperity; hence, also, the restrictions, protections, and absurd monopolies, which disgrace the statute-book of the nation;—all of which are not only direct evils, but are attended by this secondary disadvantage—that they have absorbed the funds, and consumed the time and mental energy, which, under a better system, would have been dedicated to the improvement of national and public institutions. Henceforth the government of this country must be animated by, and act up to, the general intelligence of the nation; but it will be impossible for it to advance to any considerable extent beyond it. Every patriot, therefore, will find in this fact an additional motive to qualify himself for expanding the minds, and directing the steps, of the rising generation, that Britain's glory and happiness may pass, untarnished and unimpaired, to the remotest posterity of virtuous and enlightened men.*

The question next arises, What provision in

money or land is a parent bound to make for his children? To this no answer, that would suit all circumstances, can be given. As parents cannot carry their wealth to the next world, it must of course be left to some one; and the natural feelings of mankind dictate that it should be given to those who stand nearest in kindred and highest in merit in relation to the testator. With respect to children, in ordinary circumstances, this cannot be questioned; for it is clearly the duty of parents to do all in their power to make happy the existence of those whom they have brought into the world. But difference of customs in different countries, and difference of ranks in the same country, render different principles of distribution useful and proper. In Britain, a nobleman who should distribute £100,000 equally among ten children, would do great injustice to his eldest son, to whom a title of nobility would descend, with its concomitant expenses; but a merchant who had realized £100,000, would act more wisely and justly in leaving £10,000 to each of ten children, than in attempting to found a family by entailing £82,000 on his eldest son, and leaving only £2000 to each of the other nine. I consider hereditary titles as an evil to society, and desire their abolition; but while they are permitted to exist, the distribution of wealth should bear reference to the expenses which they necessarily entail on those who inherit them. The United States of America have wisely avoided this institution: and by the laws of most of these States, an equal distribution of the family estate, real and personal, among all the children, ensues on the death of the parents. This practice appears to me to be wise and salutary. It tends to lessen that concentration of all thought and desire on themselves and their families, which is the besetting sin of the rich; and it teaches them to perceive that the prosperity of their children is indissolubly linked with that of their country. As a general rule, parents ought to make the largest provisions for those members of their families who are least able, from sex, constitution, capacity, or education, to provide for themselves.

In the lower ranks of life, where both sexes engage in labour, an equal distribution may, other circumstances being equal, be just; in the middle ranks (in which it is the custom for males to engage in business, but in which females, in general, do not), if the parents have a numerous family and moderate fortune, I should consider the sons amply provided for, by being furnished with education and a calling; while the property of the parents should be given chiefly to the dependent daughters. It is impossible, however, as I have already hinted, to lay down rules that will be universally applicable.

It is a grave question whether the indefinite accumulation of wealth should be allowed; but, however this may be determined, there should be no restriction on the power of spending and disposing of property. Entails are a great abuse, introduced by Self-Esteem and Love of Approbation acting apart from Benevolence and Conscientiousness. Reason dictates that wealth should be enjoyed only on the condition of the exercise of at least average discretion by its possessor; yet the object of entails is to secure it and its attendant influence to certain heirs, altogether independently of their intelligence, morality, and prudence. Laws have been enacted by which estates may be transmitted unimpaired from sire to son, through endless generations, although each possessor, in his turn, may be a pattern of vice and imbecility. But the law of Nature is too strong to be superseded by the legislation of ignorant and presumptuous men. The children of intelligent, virtuous, and healthy parents, are so well constituted as to need no entails to preserve their family estates

* The remarks in the text apply with still greater force to the United States of America. There, the supreme political power is wielded by the mass of the people. No rational person will maintain that one ignorant man is a proper ruler for a great nation; but additions to numbers do not alter the species. Twenty, or a hundred, or a thousand ignorant men, are not wiser than one of them; while they are much more dangerous. They inflame each other's passions, keep each other's follies in countenance, and add to each other's strength. If the United States, therefore, desire to avoid anarchy and ruin, they must educate the mass of their people.

and honours unimpaired; while, on the other hand, descendants with imbecile intellects and immoral dispositions are proud, in spite of the strictest entail, to tarnish that glory and distinction which the law vainly attempts to maintain. Accordingly, many families, in which superior qualities descend, flourish for centuries without entails; whereas others, in which immoral or foolish minds are hereditary, live in constant privation, notwithstanding the props of erroneous laws; each immoral heir of entail mortgages his life rent right, and lives a beggar and an outcast from his artificial sphere of life.

Obedience to the organic laws affords the only means of maintaining family possessions undissolved; and until men shall seek the aid which they present, in order to secure a great, virtuous, and flourishing posterity, they will in vain frame acts of Parliament to attain their object.

Parents have *rights* as well as *duties* in relation to their children. They are entitled to the produce of the child's labour during its nonage; to its respect and obedience; and, when infirm, to maintenance, if they be in want. These rights on the part of parents imply corresponding duties incumbent on children. The obligation on children to discharge them, flows directly from the dictates of Veneration, Conscientiousness, and Benevolence. It has been objected to Phrenology, that it presents no organ of filial piety—But it points to these three organs as contributing to the fulfilment of duty to parents. Veneration dictates reverence, respect, and obedience; Conscientiousness dictates gratitude, or a return for their care and affection; while Benevolence impels to the promotion of their happiness by every possible means. Adhesiveness binds old and young in the bonds of reciprocal attachment.

In the lower and middle ranks of life, parents often complain of want of respect and obedience on the part of their children; but a common cause of this evil may be found in the deficient knowledge, harsh dispositions, and rude manners of the parents themselves, which are not calculated to render them really objects of respect to the higher sentiments of their children. The mere fact of being father or mother to a child is obviously not sufficient to excite its moral affections.* The parent must manifest superior wisdom, intelligence, and affection, with a desire to promote its welfare; and then respect and obedience will naturally follow. The attempt to render a child respectful and obedient by merely telling it to be so, is as little likely to succeed as the endeavour to make it fond of music by assuring it that filial duty requires that it should love melody. We must excite the faculty of Tune by pleasing strains; and in like manner the moral sentiments must be addressed by their appropriate objects. Harsh conduct tends naturally to rouse the faculties of Combativeness, Destructiveness, and Self-Esteem; while the Moral Sentiments can be excited only by rational, kind, and just treatment: As reasonably might a father hope to gather figs from a thorn tree as to gain the love and respect of his children by maltreating or neglecting them. If a parent desire to have a docile, affectionate, and intelligent family, he must habitually address himself to their moral and intellectual powers; he must make them feel that he is wise and good—exhibit himself as the natural object of attachment and respect;—and then

by average children, the reciprocal duties of love and obedience will not be withheld.

If parents knew and paid a just regard to the natural and reasonable desires of the young, they would be far less frequently disobeyed than they actually are. Many of their commands forbid the exercise of faculties which in children pant for gratification, and which Nature intended to be gratified; and the misery and disappointment consequent on balked desire have an effect very different from that of disposing to affection and obedience. The love of muscular motion, for instance, is irrepres- sible in children, and physiology proves that the voice of Nature ought to be listened to; yet the young are frequently prohibited from yielding to this instinct, that the family or teacher may not be disturbed by noise; tasks unsuitable to their age and dispositions are imposed; their health and happiness are impaired; and when perverseness, unpalatable to the parents, ensues, the children are blamed for being cross and disobedient!

A friend, who is the father of several intelligent children, told me that before he studied Phrenology and the natural laws, he taught his children the Shorter Catechism, and required their obedience on the strength of the Fifth Commandment, "Honour thy father and thy mother, that thy days may be long in the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee," assuring them that God would punish them by premature death if they disobeyed this injunction. God, he said, had power of life and death over all, and, as he was just, he would enforce his authority. The children soon learned, however, by experience, that this consequence did not follow: they disobeyed, and were threatened; but, finding themselves still alive, they disobeyed again. He was not successful, therefore, by this method, in enforcing obedience.

After becoming acquainted with the natural laws, he still taught them the commandment, but he gave them a different explanation of it. You see, said he, that there are many objects around you, dangerous to your lives: there is fire that will burn you, water that will drown you, poison that will kill you; and also, there are many practices which will undermine the constitution of your vital organs; such as your heart, your stomach, or your lungs (explaining uses of these at the same time), and cause you to die; as you have seen John and Janet, the children of Mrs Wilson and Mrs Brown, die. Now, because I am old, and have listened to my parents, and have studied and observed a great deal, I know what will injure you, and what will not, better than you know yourselves; and I am willing to communicate my knowledge and experience to you, that you may avoid danger and not die, if you choose to listen to, and obey me: but, if you prefer taking your own way, and acting on your own ignorance, you will soon discover that God's threat is not an empty one; you will come home some day, suffering severely from your own rashness and self-will, and you will then learn whether you are right in your disobedience;—you will then understand the meaning of the commandment to be, that if you obey your parents, and avail yourself of their knowledge and experience, you will avoid danger and live; while if you neglect their counsels, you will, through sheer ignorance and self-will, fall into misfortune, suffer severely, and perhaps die. He said that this commentary, enforced from day to day by proofs of his knowing more than the children, and of his ability to advise them to their own good, was successful; they entertained a higher respect for both the commandment and him, and became more obedient.

It is a common practice with nurses, when a child falls and hurts itself, to beat the ground, or the

* An American clerical Reviewer objected to the text, that it sets aside the Bible, which commands children to honour their father and mother without regard to their qualities. He forgot that the Scriptures require parents to adorn themselves with all the Christian virtues, and that the Fifth Commandment obviously implies that they shall have fulfilled this duty, as the condition of receiving the reverence of their children.

table, against which it has struck. This is really cultivating the feeling of revenge. It gratifies the child's Self-Esteem and Destructiveness, and pacifies it for the moment. The method of proceeding dictated by the natural law is widely different. The nurse or parent should take pains to explain the cause of its falling, and present it with motives to take greater care in future. The suffering would thus be turned to good account; it would become, what it was intended by Providence to be, *a lesson* to lead the child to circumspection, patience, and reflection.

In exacting obedience from children, it should never be forgotten that their brains are very differently constituted from each other, and that their mental dispositions vary in a corresponding degree. The organ of Veneration, besides, is generally late in being developed, so that a child may be stubborn and unmanageable under one kind of treatment, or at one age, who will prove tractable and obedient under a different discipline, or at a future period. The aid which parents may derive from Phrenology can hardly be overrated. It enables them to appreciate the natural talents and dispositions of each child, to modify their treatment, and to distinguish between positively vicious tendencies (such as deceit, lying, dishonesty) and other manifestations (such as stubbornness and disobedience), which often proceed from misdirection of faculties (Self-Esteem and Firmness) that will prove extremely useful under moral guidance in the maturity of the understanding. The reason for watchfulness and anxiety is much greater in the former than in the latter case; because dishonesty, falsehood, and pilfering, betoken not only over-active organs of Secretiveness and Acquisitiveness, but a native deficiency of the controlling moral organs, which is a more serious evil. When the moral organs are adequately possessed, the perceptions of children regarding right and wrong are naturally active and acute; and although individuals with a large development of the organs of the higher sentiments may, under the impulse of the propensities, commit errors in youth, they will certainly improve as age and experience increase.—Where the moral organs are very defective, the character tends to deteriorate in mature life. After the restraints imposed by parental authority are withdrawn, and respect for the world is blunted, persons deficient in these faculties are prone to become victims to their inferior feelings, to disgrace themselves, and to bring sorrow on their connections.

As some individuals are really born with such deficiencies of the moral organs as incapacitate them for pursuing right courses of action, although they possess average intellectual power, and are free from diseased action of the brain; and as there is no legal method of restraining them unless they commit what the law accounts crime; great misery is often endured by their relatives in seeing them proceed from one step of folly and iniquity to another, until they are plunged into irretrievable ruin and disgrace. The Phrenologist who discovers that the source of the evil lies in an imperfect development of the moral organs, views them as patients, and desires that physical restraint should be applied to prevent the abuses of their lower propensities, which they have not sufficient morality to command.* But

there is no law authorizing their relatives to treat them in this manner against their inclinations. In some other countries this defect is supplied. At the village of Horn, near Ilamburg, there is a house of refuge for juvenile offenders for both sexes, named *Das Rauhe Haus*. It consists of several plain inexpensive buildings, situated in a field of a few acres, without walls, fences, bolts, bars, or gates. It is supported by subscription, and the annual cost for each individual in 1837, when I visited it, was £1.10, 4s. sterling. It then contained 54 inmates, of whom 13 were girls. A portion of them were offenders who had been condemned by the courts of law for crimes, and suffered the punishment allotted to them in the house of correction, and who afterwards, with the consent of their parents, had come voluntarily to the institution for the sake of reformation. Another portion of them consisted of young culprits apprehended for first offences, and whose parents, rather than have them tried and dealt with according to law, subscribed a contract by which the youths were delivered over for a number of years to this establishment for amendment. And a third portion consisted of children of evil dispositions, whose parents voluntarily applied to have them received into the institution, for the reformation of their vicious habits. Among this last class we saw the son of a German nobleman, who had been sent to it as a last

should punish severely those who err through moral blindness arising from deficiency of certain parts of the brain. The reviewer does not propose to inquire whether this statement be borne out by facts or not; but at once assumes that it is not, and proceeds thus: "This is, indeed, 'a Revelation,' and there can be little doubt that at Sing-Sing and Auburn it would receive a most cordial reception." As my motto is "*res non verba*" (facts not arguments), I submit the following narrative to the consideration of the Reviewer, and of other persons in a similar frame of mind to his. On the 22d October 1839, I visited the State Prison of Connecticut, at Wethersfield, accompanied by the Rev. Mr. Gallaudet, the Rev. Principal Totten, Dr. A. Brigham, and four or five other gentlemen, who had attended my course of Lectures on Phrenology, then nearly concluded at Hartford. I had illustrated the doctrine in the text by the exhibition of numerous casts, and impressed on their minds the peculiar forms of development which distinguish the best from the worst constituted brains. Mr. Pillsbury, the Superintendent of the Prison, brought a criminal into his office, without speaking one word concerning his crime or history. I declined to examine his head myself, but requested the gentlemen who accompanied me to do so, engaging to correct their observations, if they erred. They proceeded with the examination, and stated the inferences which they drew, respecting the natural dispositions of the individual. Mr. Pillsbury then read from a manuscript paper, which he had prepared before we came, the character as known to him. The coincidence between the two was complete. The prisoner was withdrawn, another was introduced, and the same process was gone through, and with the same result in regard to him. So with a third, and a fourth. Among the criminals, there were striking differences in intellect and in some of the feelings, which were correctly stated by the observers.

These experiments, I repeat, were made by the gentlemen who accompanied me; some of whom were evangelical clergymen of the highest reputation. They inferred the dispositions from actual perception of the great deficiencies in the moral organ, and the predominance of the animal organs. This combination was strikingly seen in those individuals whom Mr. Pillsbury pronounced to be, in his opinion, incorrigible; for the question was solemnly put to him, by Dr. Brigham, whether he found any of the prisoners to be irreclaimable under the existing system of treatment; and he acknowledged that he did. One of the individuals who was examined had been thirty years in the State Prison, under four different sentences, and in him the moral region of the brain was exceedingly deficient. I respectfully pressed upon the attention of the reverend gentlemen, that the facts which they had observed were institutions of the Creator, and that it was in vain for man to be angry with them, to deny them, or to esteem them of light importance.

* A writer in the New York Review stigmatises the doctrine in the text, as being "calculated to weaken our sense of accountability, or shake our confidence in moral distinctions." He quotes from the "Reports" of these Lectures the following words: "Extensive observation of the heads of criminals, and inquiry into their feelings and histories, place it beyond a doubt, that in many of them conscience is, and always has been, either very defective, or had literally no existence." "It is extremely questionable whether society

resource, and who was treated in every respect like the other inmates, and with marked success. The inmates are retained, if necessary, till they attain the age of 22. They are instructed in reading, writing, and religion, and are taught a trade. There is a master for every twelve, who never leaves them night or day. The plan of the treatment is that of parental affection, mingled with strict and steady discipline, in which punishments are used for reformation, but never with injurious severity. The teachers are drawn chiefly from the lower classes of society; and the head manager, (andidat Wicher, an unbenedicted clergyman, himself belonged to this class, and thus became thoroughly acquainted with the feelings, manners, and temptations of the pupils. When I visited the establishment, he possessed unlimited authority, and shed around him the highest and purest influences from his own beautifully moral and intellectual mind. He mentioned that only once had an attempt at crime been projected. A few of the worst boys laid a plan to burn the whole institution, and selected the time of his wife's expected confinement, when they supposed that his attention would be much engaged with her. One of them, however, revealed the design, and it was frustrated. There are very few attempts at escape; and when the reformed inmates leave the establishment, the directors use their influence to find for them situations and employments in which they may be useful, and exposed to as few temptations as possible. The plan had been in operation for four years, at the time of my visit, and I understand that it continues to flourish with unabated prosperity. An Institution in some respects similar to this one, named "La Colonie Agricole et Penitenciere de Mettray," in France, is described in the Phrenological Journal, vol. xviii., p. 206, which also has been successful.

Similar institutions are much wanted in this country, and they should be established, and aided by the law. I know of numerous and most distressing examples of young persons going to utter and irreclaimable ruin in property, health, and character, who by no human means, if not by such institutions, could have been saved.

If parents have transmitted to their children well balanced and favourably developed brains, and discharged their duty in training, educating, and fitting them out in the world, they will rarely have cause to complain of ingratitude, or want of filial piety. Where the brains of the children are ill constituted, or where training and education have been neglected or improperly conducted, the parents, in reaping sorrow and disappointment from the behaviour of their offspring, are only suffering the natural consequences of their own actions; and if these are punishments, they should read in them an intimation of the Divine displeasure of their conduct. In proportion to the development and cultivation of the moral and intellectual faculties, are gratitude and filial piety strongly and steadily manifested by children. By the well-principled and respectable members of the middle and lower ranks, parents are scarcely ever left in destitution by their children, if they are at all capable of maintaining them; but among the heartless, reckless, and grossly ignorant, this is not uncommon. The legal provision established for the poor, has tended to blunt the feelings of many individuals in regard to this duty; yet great and beautiful examples of its fulfilment are frequent, and we may expect that the number of these will increase as education and improvement advance.

Among the domestic duties I might enumerate the reciprocal obligations of masters and servants; but as the general principles which regulate the

conduct of men as members of society apply to this relationship, I shall not enter into them at present.

LECTURE VIII.

Theories of philosophers respecting the origin of society—Solution afforded by Phrenology—Man has received faculties the spontaneous action of which prompts him to live in society—Industry is man's first social duty—Labour, in moderation, is a source of enjoyment, and not a punishment—The opinion that useful labour is degrading examined—The division of labour is natural, and springs from the faculties being bestowed in different degrees of strength on different individuals—One combination fits for one pursuit, and another for another—Gradations of rank are also natural, and arise from differences in native talents, and in acquired skill—Gradations of rank are beneficial to all.

I proceed now to consider those *social duties and rights* which are not strictly domestic. The first subject of inquiry is into the origin of society itself. On this question many fanciful theories have been given to the world. It has engaged the imagination of the poet and the intellect of the philosopher. Ovid has described mankind as at first in a state of innocence and happiness during what is termed the golden age, and as declining gradually into vice and misery through the silver, brazen, and iron ages:—

"The golden age was first, when man, yet new,
No rule but uncorrupted reason knew;
And with a native bent did good pursue.
Unforced by punishment, unawed by fear,
His words were simple, and his soul sincere.

No walls were yet; nor fence, nor moat, nor mound
No drum was heard, nor trumpet's angry sound:
Nor swords were forged; but void of care and crime,
The soft creation slept away their time.

* * * * *
The flowers unown'd, in fields and meadows reigned,
And western winds immortal springs maintained.
In following years, the bearded corn ensued,
From earth unask'd, nor was that earth renewed.
From veins of valleys milk and nectar broke,
And honey sweating through the pores of oak."

To this succeeded too rapidly the silver, the brazen, and the iron ages; which last, the world had reached in the days of Ovid, and in which, unfortunately, it still remains.

Rousseau, who was rather a poet than a philosopher, has written speculations "on the origin and foundations of the existing inequalities among men," which have powerfully attracted the attention of the learned. He informs us that he "sees man such as he must have proceeded from the hands of Nature, less powerful than some animals, less active than others, but, taking him on the whole, more advantageously organized than any. He sees him satisfying his hunger under an oak, quenching his thirst at the first rivulet, finding his bed under the trees whose fruit had afforded him a repast, and thus satisfied to the full of every desire."*

"It is impossible," continues he, "to conceive how, in this original condition, one man could have more need of another than a wolf or an ape has of his fellows; or, supposing the need to exist, what motive could induce the other to satisfy it; or how, in this latter case, the two could agree upon the terms of their social intercourse."

* Discours sur l'Origine et les Fondemens d'Inégalité parmi les Hommes. 4to edit. Geneva, 1752, p. 48.

From these premises, Rousseau draws the conclusion, that "the first who, having enclosed a piece of ground, took upon himself to call it 'mine,' and found individuals so foolish as to believe him, was the true founder of civil society." What crimes, what wars, what murders, what miseries and horrors, would he have spared to the human race, who tearing up the land-marks, or filling up the ditches, had cried to his equals, 'Beware how you listen to this impostor! You are undone if you forget that the fruits of the earth belong to all, and the soil to none!'" P. 87.

The fundamental error in Rousseau's speculation consists in his endowing man, in his primitive condition, with whatever faculties he pleases; or rather, in bestowing upon him no principles of action except such as suit his own theory. Numerous antagonists have combated these speculations, and among others, Wieland has written half a volume on the subject; but their absurdity is so evident, that I do not consider it necessary to enter into any lengthened refutation of them. The mistake of such theorists is, that they assume the mind to be altogether a blank—to have no spontaneous desires and activity; they imagine it to be similarly constituted to the ear, which, in a state of health, hears no sounds till excited by the vibrations of the air, and ascribe the origin of almost all our passions and inclinations to the circumstances which first evolve them.

This mode of philosophizing resembles that which should account for an eruption of Mount Vesuvius by ascribing it to the rent in the surface of the mountain, through which the lava bursts, instead of attributing it to the mighty energies of the volcanic matter buried beneath its rocks.

Other philosophers besides Rousseau have theorized on the constitution of society, without previously investigating the constitution of the human mind. Mr. Millar, in his "Observations concerning the Distinction of Ranks in Society," proceeds at once "to shew the effects of poverty and barbarism with regard to the passions of sex, to the general occupations of a people, and the degree of consideration which is paid to the women as members of society," without at all inquiring into the innate tendencies and capacities of man, from which the facts, for which he wishes to account, proceed. However interesting such a work may be, as a contribution to the natural history of man, it throws no light on the question, whence the conditions which it records have arisen. It leaves the mind unsatisfied on the general and fundamental question, Whether society, such as it has existed, and such as it now exists, has arisen from human institutions, arbitrary in their origin, and controllable by the human will; or whether it has sprung from instincts referable to nature itself?

Lord Kames, one of the shrewdest and most observant philosophers of the old school, has taken a more rational view of the origin of society. Perceiving that man has been endowed with natural aptitudes and desires, he founds upon these every institution which is universal among mankind. He attributes the origin of society to "the social principle." Men became hunters from a natural appetite to hunt, and by hunting appeased their hunger. They became shepherds from seeing that it was easier to breed tame animals than to catch wild ones, after hunting had made them scarce. Being shepherds, population increased, and necessity made them desire an increase of food. They saw the earth in some climates producing corn spontaneously, and the idea arose that by forwarding its growth and removing obstructing weeds, more corn could be produced; hence they became agriculturists. The idea of property sprang from the "hoarding appetite." Lord Kames ascribes the various insti-

tutions which exist in society to principles innate in the mind, and not to chance or factitious circumstances.

Locke and some other writers have assigned the origin of society to reason, and represented it as springing from a compact by which individual men surrendered, for the general welfare, certain portions of their private rights, and submitted to various restraints; receiving, in return, protection and other advantages arising from the social state. This idea also is erroneous. Society has always been far advanced before the idea of such a compact began to be entertained; and even then it has occurred only to the minds of philosophers. What solution, then, of this problem, does Phrenology offer?

It shews that man possesses mental faculties endowed with spontaneous activity, which give rise to many desires equally definite with the appetite for food. Among these are several social instincts, from the spontaneous activity of which society has obviously proceeded. The Phrenologist, then, follows on the same track with Lord Kames; but with greater precision. By studying the organs of the mind, he has ascertained the faculties which are really primitive, their spheres of action, and the differences in their relative vigour produced by differences in the relative size of the organs in different individuals. These are important additions to our means of arriving at sound views of the origin of society.

From the three faculties of Amativeness, Philoprogenitiveness, and Adhesiveness, the matrimonial compact derives its origin. Adhesiveness has a yet wider sphere of action: it is the gregarious instinct, or propensity to congregate; it desires the society of our fellow-men generally. Hence its existence indicates that we are intended to live in the social state. The nature and objects of other faculties besides Adhesiveness, lead to the same conclusion. Neither Benevolence, which prompts us to confer benefits,—nor Love of Approbation, whose gratification is the applause and good opinion of others,—nor Veneration, which gives a tendency to respect, and yield obedience to, superiors,—nor Conscientiousness, which holds the balance between competing rights,—has full scope, except in general society; the domestic circle is too contracted for their gratification.

The faculty of Conscientiousness, in particular, seems necessarily to imply the existence of other individuals in the social state. To give rise to the exercise of justice, and the fulfilment of duty, there must necessarily be two parties,—the one to perform, and the other to receive. Conscientiousness would be as little useful to a solitary human being, as speech to a hermit; while, even in the domestic circle, the faculties of Benevolence, Philoprogenitiveness, and Veneration, are more directly called into play than it. The head of the family bestows through affection and bounty; the dependents receive with kindness and respect; and when these emotions act with great and spontaneous energy, the feeling of duty, on the part of either, rarely mingles its influence. The sphere in which Conscientiousness is most directly exercised is that in which the interests and inclinations of equals come into competition. Conscientiousness, aided by intellect, then determines the rights of each, and inspires them with the feeling that it is their duty to perform so much, and to demand no more. Phrenology enables us to prove that Conscientiousness is not a factitious sentiment, reared up in society, as many moral philosophers and metaphysicians have taught,—but a primitive power, having its specific organ. This fact is essential to the argument; and, in the "System of Phrenology," I have stated the nature of the evidence by which it is established.

The adaptation of the intellectual faculties to society is equally conspicuous. The faculty of Language implies the presence of intelligent beings, with whom we may communicate by speech. The faculties of Causality and Comparison, which are the fountains of reasoning, imply our associating with other intellectual beings, with whose perceptions and experience we may compare our own. Without combination, what advance could be made in science, arts, or manufactures? As food is related to hunger, and light to the sense of vision, so is society adapted to the social faculties of man. The presence of human beings is indispensable to the gratification and excitement of our mental powers in general. What a void and craving is experienced by those who are cut off from communication with their fellows! Persons who are placed in remote and solitary stations on the confines of civilization, become dull in intellect, shy, unsocial, and unhappy. The most atrocious criminals, when placed in solitary confinement without work, lose their ferocity, are subdued, and speedily sink in health and vigour. The stimulus yielded to their faculties by the presence of their fellow-men, is wanting.

The balmy influence of society on the human mind may be discovered in the vivacious and generally happy aspect of those who live in the bosom of a family, or mingle freely with the world, contrasted with the cold, starved, and stagnant manners and expression of those who retire from social sympathies and life.

A man whose muscular, digestive, respiratory, and circulating systems, greatly predominate in energy over the brain and nervous system, stands less in need of society to gratify his mental faculties, than an individual oppositely constituted: he delights in active muscular exercise, and is never so happy as with the elastic turf beneath his feet, and the blue vault of heaven over his head. But where the brain and nervous system are more energetic, there arise mental wants which can be gratified only in society, and residence in a city is felt indispensable to enjoyment: the mind flags and becomes feeble when not stimulated by collision and converse with kindred spirits. Hence, the social state appears to be as natural to man as it is to the bee, the raven, or the sheep. This question being set at rest, the duties implied in the constitution of society are next to be considered.

The first duty imposed on man in relation to society is *industry*—a duty, the origin and sanction of which are easily discoverable. Man is sent into the world naked, unprotected, and unprovided for. He does not, like the lower animals, find his skin clothed with a sufficient covering of hair, feathers, or scales, but must provide garments for himself; he cannot perch on a bough or burrow in a hole, but must rear a dwelling to protect himself from the weather; he does not, like the ox, find his nourishment under his feet, but must hunt or cultivate the ground. To capacitate him for the performance of these duties, he has received a body fitted for labour, and a mind calculated to animate and direct his exertions; while the external world has been created with the wisest adaptation to his constitution.

Many of us have been taught, by our religious instructors, that labour is a curse imposed by God on man as a punishment for sin. I remarked in the first Lecture, that philosophy cannot tell whether sin *was* or *was not* the cause which induced the Almighty to constitute man such as we now see him, an organized being, composed of bones, muscles, blood-vessels, nerves, respiratory and digestive organs, and a brain calculated to manifest a rational mind,—and to confer on external nature its present qualities, adapted to give scope and exercise to these powers,

—but that, constituted as we actually are, labour, which, in its proper sense, means *exertion, either bodily or mental, for useful purposes*, is not only no calamity, but the grand fountain of our enjoyment.* Unless we exercise our limbs, what pleasure can they afford to us? If we do not exercise them, they become diseased, and we are punished with positive pain: hence the duty of bodily exertion is a law of God, written in our frames, as strikingly as if it were emblazoned on the sky. Constituted as we are, it is not labour, but inactivity, which is an evil,—that is, which is visited by God with suffering and disease. The misery of idleness has been a favourite theme of moralists in every age; and its baneful influence on the bodily health, has equally attracted the notice of the physician, and of general observers. Happiness, in truth, is nothing but the gratification of active faculties; and hence, the more active our faculties are, within the limits of health, the greater is our enjoyment.

"Life's cares are comforts; such by heaven designed:
He that has none must make them, or be wretched.
Cares are employments, and without employ
The soul is on a rack, the rack of rest,
To souls most adverse—action all their joy."

The prevalent notion that labour is an evil must have arisen from ignorance of the constitution of man, and from contemplating the effects of labour carried to excess.

Bodily and mental activity, therefore, being the law of our nature and the fountain of our enjoyment, I observe, first, that they may be directed to *useful* or to *useless* purposes; and that they may be carried to excess. Exertion for the attainment of useful objects, is generally termed labour; and because of its utility, men have, with strange perversity, looked upon it as degrading! Exertion for mere capricious self-gratification, and directed to no useful end, has, on the other hand, been dignified with the name of pleasure, and is esteemed honourable. These notions appear to be injurious errors, which obtain no countenance from the natural laws. Indeed the proposition ought to be reversed. Pleasure increases in proportion to the number of faculties employed, and it becomes purer and more lasting, the higher the faculties are which are engaged in the enterprise. The pursuit of a great and beneficial object, such as providing for a family, or discharging an important duty to society, calls into energetic action not only a greater variety of faculties, but also faculties of a higher order, namely, the moral sentiments and intellect, than those frivolous occupations, misnamed pleasures, which are directed to self-indulgence and the gratification of vanity alone.

The reason why labour has so generally been regarded as an evil, is its very unequal distribution among individuals—many contriving to exempt themselves from all participation in it (though not to the increase of their own happiness), while others are pressed with an excessive share. Both extremes are improper; and the hope may reasonably be indulged, that when society shall become so far enlightened as to esteem that honourable which God has rendered at once profitable and pleasant,—and when labour shall be properly distributed, and confined within the bounds of moderation,—it will assume its true aspect, and be hailed by all as a rational source of enjoyment.

Regarding bodily and mental activity, therefore, as institutions of the Creator, I observe, in the next

* A prisoner in the jail of Ayr, on being permitted to labour, observed that "he never knew before what a pleasant thing work is."—*Fifth Report of the Inspector of Prisons*, p. 4.

place, that, as man has been destined for society, a *division of occupations* is indispensable to his welfare. If every one were to insist on cultivating the ground, there would be no manufacturers, carpenters, or builders. If all were to prefer the exercise of the constructive arts, we should have no agriculturists and no food. The Creator has arranged the spontaneous division of labour among men, by the simplest, yet most effectual means. He has bestowed the mental faculties in different degrees of relative strength on different individuals, and thereby given them at once the desire and the aptitude for different occupations. Phrenology renders clear the origin of differences of employment. The metaphysicians treat only of general powers of the mind. They enumerate among the active principles ambition, the love of power, the love of kindred, and so forth, while their catalogue of intellectual faculties embraces only Perception, Conception, Abstraction, Attention, Memory, Judgment, and Imagination. Many of them deny that individuals differ in the degrees in which they possess these powers; and ascribe all actual differences to education, association, habit, and a variety of accidental circumstances.

With their philosophy for our guide, we are called on to explain by what process of arrangement, or chapter of accidents, the general powers of Perception, Memory, Judgment, and Imagination, fit one man to be a carpenter, another to be a sailor, a third a merchant, a fourth an author, a fifth a painter, a sixth an engineer; and how they communicate to each a special predilection for his trade. How comes it to pass, according to their views, that some who utterly fail in one pursuit, succeed to admiration in another? and whence is it that there was no jostling in the community at first, and that very little harsh friction occurs now, in arranging the duties to be performed by each individual member? We next require a solution of the problem—by what cause one man's ambition takes the direction of war, another's that of agriculture, and a third's that of painting or making speeches, if all their native aptitudes and tendencies are the same, both in kind and degree,—how one man delights to spend his life in accumulating wealth, and another knows no pleasure equal to that of dissipating and squandering it?

I do not detain you with the ingenious theories that have been propounded by the metaphysicians, as solutions of these questions, but come at once to the explanation afforded by the new philosophy. Phrenology shews that man has received a variety of primitive faculties, each having a specific sphere of action, and standing in specific relations to certain external objects, that he takes an interest in these objects in consequence of their aptitude to gratify his faculties; and that the same is the case also in regard to the lower animals. If a hare and a cat, for instance, were lying in the same field, and a mouse were to stray between them, the hare would see it pass without interest,—while the cat's blood would be on fire, every hair would bristle, and it would seize and devour it. The cat possesses a carnivorous instinct, of which the mouse is the external object, and hence the source of its interest. The hare wants that instinct, and hence its indifference.

Every sane individual of the human race enjoys the same number of faculties, but each power is manifested by means of a particular portion of the brain, and acts with a degree of energy, (other things being equal,) corresponding to the size of that part. These parts, or organs, are combined in different relative proportions in different individuals, and give rise to differences of talents and dispositions. Hence, the individual in whom Combativeness and Destructiveness are the largest organs, desires to be a sol-

dier; he in whom Veneration, Hope, and Wonder are the largest, desires to be a minister of religion; he in whom Constructiveness, Weight, and Form are largest, desires to be a mechanician; and he in whom Constructiveness, Form, Colouring, Imitation, and Ideality predominate, is inspired with the love of painting.

The Creator, by bestowing on all the race the same number of faculties, and endowing them with the same functions, has fitted us for constituting one common family. In consequence of our common nature, we understand each other's instincts, desires, talents, and pursuits, and are prepared to act in concert; while by the superiority in particular powers conferred on particular individuals, variety of character and talent, and the division of labour, are effectually provided for.

The division of labour, therefore, is not an expedient devised by man's sagacity, but a direct result of his constitution; exactly as happens in the case of some of the inferior animals, which live in society and divide their duties without possessing the attribute of reason. The differences in relative size in the cerebral organs of different individuals afford another proof that man has been created expressly to live and act as a social being.

When we compare the corporeal frames of men, we find that they also differ in stature, strength, and temperament; some are large, strong, active, and energetic; while others are small, feeble, or sluggish. In a world in which the means of subsistence can be gained only by vigorous exertion, these differences alone would give rise to inferiority and superiority among individuals. But when we examine the brain, on which the mental qualities depend, and perceive that differences in regard to the size of the mental organs are, equally extensive and striking; the fact of differences in social condition being an institution of nature is determined. In one man the brain is large, the temperament is active, and the three regions of the animal, moral, and intellectual organs, are all favourably developed; such a person is one of nature's nobility. He is endowed with native energy by his temperament, and mental power by his brain; and he needs besides, only knowledge, with a fair field of action, to attain the highest prizes which are offered by a bountiful Creator to human virtue, industry, and talent. Another individual has inherited from birth the lymphatic temperament, and is constitutionally inert, or he has received a small brain, which is incapable of vigorous manifestations. In a scene where valuable objects can be attained only by capacity and energy, such a person must, of necessity, give place to him who has been favoured with higher endowments. A third individual, perhaps, has received several organs developed in a superior degree, which fit him to acquire distinction in a particular department of life; but he is deficient in other organs, and is in consequence unfit to advance successfully in other walks. Such a man may, if he choose his vocation wisely in relation to his special endowments, assume a high station; if unwisely, he may stand low in the scale of social consideration. These differences give rise to differences in social condition, altogether irrespective of human arrangements.

Gradations of social condition being thus institutions of God, those men are wild enthusiastic dreamers, and not philosophers, who contemplate their abolition. This proposition, however, does not imply approval of artificial distinctions of rank, independent of natural endowments. These are the inventions of ignorant and selfish men; they are paltry devices to secure, by means of parchments, the advantages of high qualities, without the necessary possession of them. As civilization and knowledge

advance, these will be renounced as ridiculous, like the ponderous wigs, cocked hats, laced coats, and swords, of bygone centuries. It is unfortunate for society when a fool or rogue is the possessor of high rank and title; for these attract the respect of many to his foolish or vicious deeds, and to his erroneous opinions.

Nature has instituted still another cause of social differences. Man has received faculties, or capacities, adapted to external nature, but he has not been inspired with information concerning the qualities and adaptations of objects, or with intuitive knowledge of the best manner of applying his own powers. He has been left to find out these by observation and reflection. If we select twenty men whose brains, temperament, and bodily constitution, are alike, but of whom ten have sedulously applied their faculties to the study of nature and her capabilities, while the other ten have sought only pleasure in trivial pursuits, it is obvious that in all social attainments the former will speedily surpass the latter. If both classes wished to build a house, you would find the observing and reflecting men in possession of the lever, the pulley, the hammer, the axe, and the saw; while the hunters and the fishers would be pushing loads with their hands, or lifting them with their arms, and shaping timber with sharp-edged stones. In civilized society the same results appear. An individual who has learned how to use his natural powers to the best advantage,—in other words, who has acquired knowledge and skill,—is decidedly superior to him, who, although born with equal native talents, has never been taught the best method of applying them.

When we view Nature's scheme of social gradation, we recognise in it an institution beneficial to all. The man who stands at the bottom of the scale, does so because he is actually lowest either in natural endowments, or in acquired skill; but even in that lowest rank he enjoys advantages superior to those he could have commanded by his talents, if he had stood alone. He derives many advantages from the abilities and acquirements of his fellow-men. In point of fact, an able-bodied, steady, and respectable labourer in Britain, is better clothed, better fed, and better lodged, than the chief of a savage tribe in New South Wales.

I anticipate that it will be objected, that although this may be a correct exposition of the origin of gradations of ranks; and although, if the principles now explained were alone allowed to determine the station of individuals, none could have just cause of complaint, yet that the practical result is widely different; because weak, wicked, and indolent men, are often found in possession of the highest gifts of fortune and the loftiest social positions; while able, good, and enlightened individuals, stand low in the scale. I shall consider this subject in the next lecture.

LECTURE IX.

ON THE PAST, PRESENT, AND PROSPECTIVE CONDITIONS OF SOCIETY.

The question considered, Why are vicious or weak persons sometimes found prosperous, while the virtuous and talented enjoy no worldly distinction—Individuals honoured and rewarded according as they display qualities adapted to the state of the society in which they live—Mankind hitherto animated chiefly by the selfish faculties—Prospective improvement of the moral aspect of society—Retrospect of its previous conditions—Savage, pastoral, agricultural, and commercial stages; and qualities requisite for the prosperity of individuals in each—Disaffec-

tion of moral and intellectual minds with the present state of society—Increasing tendency of society to honour and reward virtue and intelligence—Artificial impediments to this—Hereditary titles and entails—Their bad effects—Pride of ancestry, rational and irrational—Aristocratic feeling in America and Europe—Means through which the future improvement of society may be expected—Two views of the proper objects of human pursuit; one representing man's enjoyments as principally animal, and the other as chiefly moral and intellectual—The selfish faculties at present paramount in society—Consequences of this—Keen competition of individual interests, and its advantages and disadvantages—Present state of Britain unsatisfactory.

In the last Lecture we considered the origins of society, of the division of labour, and of differences of rank. I proceed to discuss an objection which may be urged against some of the views then stated—namely, that occasionally persons of defective moral principle, though of considerable talent,—and, in other instances, weak and indolent men, are found in possession of high rank and fortune, while able, good, and enlightened individuals stand low in the scale of public honour. Let us endeavour to investigate the cause of this anomaly, and inquire whether the evil admits of a remedy.

Man is endowed with two great classes of faculties, so different in their nature, desires, and objects, that he appears almost like two beings conjoined in one: I refer to the animal propensities and moral sentiments. All the propensities have reference to self-sustenance, self-gratification, or self-aggrandizement, and do not give rise to a single feeling of disinterested love or regard for the happiness of other beings. Even the domestic affections, when acting independently of the moral sentiments, prompt us to seek only a selfish gratification, without regard to the welfare of the beings who afford it. Examples of this kind may be met with, every day, in the seductions, and temporary alliances, of individuals of strong animal passions and deficient morality. We observe, also, that parents deficient in intellect, in their ecstasies of fondness for their offspring, inspired by Philoprogenitiveness, often spoil them, and render them miserable; which is just indulging their own affections, without enlightened regard for the welfare of their objects. When Combativeness and Destructiveness are active, it is to assail other individuals, or to protect ourselves against their aggressions. When Acquisitiveness is pursuing its objects, the appropriation of property to ourselves is its aim. When Self-Esteem inspires us with its emotions, we are prompted to place ourselves, and our own interests and gratifications, first in all our considerations. When Love of Action is supremely active, we desire esteem, glory, praise, or advancement, as public acknowledgments of our own superiority over other men. Secretiveness and Cautionness, from which arise *savoir faire* and circumspection, are auxiliaries of the selfish desires. All these feelings are necessary to the subsistence of the individual or the race, are good in themselves, and produce beneficial results when directed by the higher faculties. But, nevertheless, self-gratification is their primary object, and the advantages conferred by them on others follow only as secondary consequences of their actions.

The other class of faculties alluded to, is that of the moral sentiments, Benevolence, Veneration, and Conscientiousness; these take a loftier, a more disinterested and beneficent range. Benevolence desires to diffuse universal happiness. It is not satisfied with mere self-enjoyment. As long as it sees a sentient being miserable, whom it could render happy, it desires to do so; and its own satisfaction is not complete till that be accomplished. Veneration desires to invest with esteem, and treat with deference

and respect, every human being who manifests virtue and wisdom; and to adore the Creator as the fountain of universal perfection. Conscientiousness desires to introduce and maintain an all-pervading justice, a state of society in which the merits of the humblest individuals shall not be overlooked, but shall be appreciated and rewarded; and in which the pretensions of the egotist and the ambitious shall be circumscribed within the limits of their real deserts.

There are certain faculties which may be regarded as auxiliaries of these. Ideality desires to realize the excellent and the beautiful, in every object and action. It longs for a world in which all things shall be fair, and lovely, and invested with the most perfect attributes of form, colour, proportion, and arrangement, and in which the human mind shall manifest only dispositions in harmony with such a scene. Wonder desires the new and the untried, and serves to urge us forward in our career of improvement; while the sentiment of Hope smooths and gilds the whole vista of futurity presented to the mind's eye; representing every desire as possible to be fulfilled, and every good as attainable.

The intellectual faculties are the servants equally of both orders of faculties. Our powers of observation and reflection may be employed in perpetrating the blackest crimes, or performing the most beneficent actions, according as they are directed by the propensities, or by the moral sentiments.

We have seen, that among these faculties there are several which render man a social being; and we find him, accordingly, living in society, in all circumstances and in all stages of refinement. Society does not all at once attain the highest degree of virtue, intelligence, and refinement. Like the individual, it passes through stages of infancy, youth, full vigour, and decay. Hence it has different standards at different times, by which it estimates the qualities of its individual members. In the rudest state, the selfish faculties have nearly unbridled sway,—rapine, fraud, tyranny, and violence prevail; while, on the other hand, among a people in whom the moral sentiments are vigorous, private advantage is pursued with a constant respect to the rights of other men. In the former state of society, we should naturally expect to see selfish, ambitious, and unprincipled men, who are strong in mind and body, in possession of the highest rank and greatest wealth; because, in the contention of pure selfishness, such qualities alone are fitted to succeed. In a society animated by the moral sentiments and intellect as the governing powers, we should expect to find places of the highest honour and advantage occupied by the most moral, intelligent, and useful members of the community; because these qualities would be most esteemed. The former state of society characterizes all barbarous nations; and the latter, which is felt by well-constituted minds to be the great object of human desire, has never yet been fully realized. By many, the idea of realizing it is regarded as Utopian; by others, its accomplishment is believed possible; by all, it is admitted to be desirable. It is desired, because the moral sentiments exist, and instinctively long for the reign of justice, good will, refinement, and enjoyment, and are grieved by the suffering which so largely abounds in the present condition of humanity.

The question is an important one, Whether man be destined to proceed, in this world, for an indefinite time, constantly desiring pure and moral institutions, yet ever devoting himself to inferior objects,—to the unsatisfying labours of misdirected selfishness, vanity, and ambition: or whether he will, at length, be permitted to realize his loftier conceptions and enter on a thoroughly rational state of existence.

The fact of the higher sentiments being constituent elements of our nature, seems to warrant us in expecting an illimitable improvement in the condition of society. Unless our nature had been fitted to rise up to the standard which these faculties desire to reach, we may presume that they would not have been bestowed on us. They cannot have been intended merely to dazzle us with phantom illusions of purity, intelligence, and happiness, which we are destined ever to pursue in vain.

But what encouragement does experience afford for trusting that under any future social arrangements rank will be awarded only to merit? Man is a progressive being, and, in his social institutions, he ascends through the scale of his faculties, very much as an individual does, in rising from infancy to manhood. In his social capacity he commences with institutions and pursuits related almost exclusively to the simplest of his animal desires, and his most obvious intellectual perceptions.

Men, in their early condition, are described by historians as savages, wandering amidst wide-spreading forests, or over extensive savannas, clothed in the skins of animals, drawing their chief sustenance from the chase, and generally waging bloody wars with their neighbours. This is the outward manifestation of feeble intellect and Constructiveness, of dormant Ideality, very weak moral sentiments, and active propensities. The skulls of savage nations present indications of a corresponding development of brain.* In this condition there is little distinction of rank, except the superiority conferred on individuals by age, energy, or courage; and there is no division of labour, or diversity of employment, except that the most painful and laborious duties are imposed on the women. All stand so near the bottom of the scale, that there is yet little scope for social distinctions.

In the next stage, we find men congregated into tribes, possessed of cattle, and assuming the aspect of a community, although still migratory in their habits. This state implies the possession of implements and utensils fabricated by means of ingenuity and industry; also a wider range of social attachment, and so much of moral principle as to prompt individuals to respect the property of each other in their own tribe. This is the pastoral condition, and it proclaims an advance in the development of Intellect, Constructiveness, Adhesiveness, and the Moral Sentiments. In this stage, however, of the social progress, there is still a very imperfect manifestation of the moral and intellectual faculties. Acquisitiveness, unenlightened by intellect, and undirected by morality, desires to acquire wealth by plunder rather than by industry; and the intellectual faculties have not yet comprehended the advantages of manufactures and commerce. In this stage, men regard neighbouring tribes as their natural enemies,—make war on them, spoil their substance, murder their males, and carry their females and children into captivity. They conceive that they crown themselves with glory by these achievements.

In such a state of society, it is obvious that those individuals who possess, in the highest degree, the qualities most useful to the community, and most esteemed according to their standard of virtue, will be advanced to the highest rank, with all its attendant advantages and honours. Great physical strength, a large brain and active temperament, with predominating Combativeness, Destructiveness, Self-Esteem, Love of Approbation, and Firmness, with a very limited portion of morality and reflecting intellect, will carry an individual to the rank of a chief or leader of his countrymen.

* Strong evidence of this fact is presented in Dr Morton's work on the character and crania of the native American Indians.

The next step in the progress of society, is the agricultural condition; and this implies a still higher evolution of intellect and moral sentiment. To sow in spring with a view of reaping in autumn, requires not only economy and prudence in preserving stores and stock, and the exercise of ingenuity in fabricating implements of husbandry, but a stretch of reflection embracing the whole intermediate period, and a subjugation of the impatient animal propensities to the intellectual powers. To insure to him who sows, that he shall also reap, requires a general combination in defence of property, and a practical acknowledgment of the claims of justice, which indicate decided activity in the moral sentiments. In point of fact, the brains of nations who have attained to this condition are more highly developed in the moral and intellectual regions, than those of savage tribes.

In order to reach the highest rank in this stage of society, individuals must possess a greater endowment of reflecting intellect and moral sentiment, in proportion to their animal propensities, than was necessary to attain supremacy in the pastoral state.

When nations become commercial, and devote themselves to manufactures, their pursuits demand the activity of still higher endowments, together with extensive knowledge of natural objects, and their relations and qualities. In this condition, arts and sciences are sedulously cultivated; processes of manufacture of great complexity, and extending over a long period of time, are successfully conducted; extensive transactions between individuals, living often in different hemispheres, and who probably never saw each other personally, are carried on with regularity, integrity, and despatch; laws, regulating the rights and duties of individuals engaged in the most complicated transactions, are enacted; and this complicated social machinery moves, on the whole, with a smoothness and regularity which are truly admirable. Such a scene is a high manifestation of moral and intellectual power; and man, in this condition, appears, for the first time, invested in his rational character. Observation shews that the organs of the superior faculties develop themselves more fully in proportion to the advances of civilization, and that they are *de facto* largest in the most moral and enlightened nations.

This is the stage at which society has arrived in our day, in a great part of Europe, and in the United States of America. In other parts of the globe the inferior conditions still appear. But even in the most advanced nations, the triumph of the rational portion of man's nature is incomplete. Our institutions, manners, desires, and aspirations, still partake, to a great extent, of the characteristics of the propensities. Wars from motives of aggrandizement or ambition; unjust, and sometimes cruel laws; artificial privileges in favour of classes or individuals; restrictions calculated to impede general prosperity for the advantage of a few; inordinate love of wealth; overweening ambition; and many other inferior desires, still flourish in vigour among us. In such a state of society, it is impossible that the virtuous and intelligent alone should reach the highest social stations.

In Britain, that individual is fitted to be most successful in the career of wealth and its attendant advantages, who possesses vigorous health, industrious habits, great selfishness, a powerful intellect, and just so much of the moral feelings as to serve for the profitable direction of his inferior powers. This combination of endowments renders self-aggrandizement the leading impulse to action. It provides sufficient intellect to attain the object in view, and morality enough to restrain every desire which would tend to defeat it. A person so constituted

feels his faculties to be in harmony with his external condition: he has no lofty aspirations after either goodness or enjoyment which the state of society does not permit him to realize; he is satisfied to dedicate his undivided energies to the active business of life, and is generally successful. He acquires wealth and distinction, stands high in social esteem, transmits respectability and abundance to his family, and dies in a good old age.

Although his mind does not belong to the highest order; yet, being in harmony with external circumstances, and little annoyed by the imperfections which exist around him, he is one of that class which, in the present social condition of Britain, is reasonably happy. We are in that stage of our moral and intellectual progress which corresponds with the supremacy of the above-mentioned combination of faculties. In savage times, the rude, athletic warrior was the chief of his tribe; and he was also probably the most happy, because he possessed, in the greatest degree, the qualities necessary for success, and was deficient in all the feelings which, in his circumstances, could not obtain gratification. If he had had Benevolence, Ideality, Veneration, and Conscientiousness also largely developed, he would have been unhappy, by the aspirations after higher objects and conditions which they would have introduced into his mind. The same rule holds good in our own case. Those individuals who have either too little of the selfish propensities or too much of the moral feelings, are neither successful nor happy in the present state of British society. The former cannot successfully maintain their ground, in the great struggle for property which is going on around them; while the latter, although they may be able to keep their places in the competition for wealth, are constantly grieved by the misery and imperfection which they are compelled to witness, but cannot remove. They have the habitual consciousness, also, that they are labouring for the mere means of enjoyment, without ever reaching enjoyment itself; and that their lives are spent, as it were, in a vain show or a feverish dream.

In these examples, we observe that society has been slowly but regularly advancing towards elevating virtue and intelligence to public honour; and we may reasonably hope that, in proportion to the increase of knowledge, especially of the law which renders moral and intellectual attainment indispensable to the highest enjoyment, will the tendency to do homage to virtue increase. The impediments to a just reward of individual merit, do not appear to be inherent in human nature, but contingent. There are, however, *artificial* impediments to the accomplishment of this end, among which stand conspicuous hereditary titles of honour.

The feudal kings of Europe early acquired, or assumed, the power of conferring titles of honour and dignity on men of distinguished qualities, as a mark of approbation of their conduct, and as a reward for their services to the state. As reason and morality urge no objections to a title of honour being conferred on a man who has done an important service to his country, the practice of ennobling individuals was easily introduced. The favoured peer, however, naturally loved his offspring; and without considering any consequences beyond his own gratification, he induced the king to add a right of succession, in favour of his children, to the dignities and privileges conferred on himself. We now know that if he himself had really been one of *Nature's* nobility, and if he had allied himself to a partner, also possessing high qualities of brain and general constitution, and if the two had lived habitually in accordance with the natural laws, he would have transmitted his noble nature to his children; and they, having the stamp

of native dignity upon them, would have needed no patent from an earthly sovereign, to maintain them in their father's rank. But this law of Nature being then unknown; or the noble, perhaps, having attained to distinction by one or two distinguished qualities merely, which were held in much esteem in his own day, and being still deficient in many high endowments; or having from passion, love of wealth, ambition, or some other unworthy motive, married an inferior partner, he is conscious that he cannot rely on his children inheriting natural superiority, and he therefore desires, by artificial means, to preserve to them for ages, the rank, wealth, titles, and power, which he has acquired, and which Nature intended to be the rewards in every generation solely of superior endowments. The king grants a right of succession to the titles and dignity; and Parliament authorizes the father to place his estates under entail: By these means, his heirs, however profligate, imbecile, and unworthy of honour and distinction, are enabled to hold the highest rank in society, to exercise the privileges of hereditary legislators, and to receive the revenues of immense estates, which they may squander or devote to the most immoral of purposes. In these instances, legislators have directly contradicted Nature. All this, you will perceive, is following out the principle, that individual aggrandizement is the great object of each successive occupant of this world. These measures, however, are not successful. They are productive, often, of misery: as every one knows who has observed the wretched condition of many nobles and heirs of entail, whose profligacy and imbecility render them unfit for their artificial station.

In regard to society at large, this practice produces baneful effects. A false standard of consideration is erected; the respect and admiration of the people are directed away from virtue and intelligence to physical grandeur and ostentation, and low objects of ambition are presented to the industrious classes of every grade. When extraordinary success in trade raises the banker or merchant to great wealth, instead of devoting it, and the talents by means of which it was acquired, to the improvement and elevation of the class from which he has sprung, he becomes ashamed of his origin, is fired with the ambition of being created a noble, and is generally found wielding his whole energies, natural and acquired, in the ranks of the aristocracy against the people. If the distinctions instituted by Nature were left to operate, the effect would be that the people would, as a general rule, venerate in others, and themselves desire, the qualities most estimable according to their own moral and intellectual perceptions; the standard of consideration would be rectified and raised in proportion to their advance in knowledge and wisdom; and a great obstruction to improvement, created by artificial and hereditary rank, would be removed.

We are told that in the United States of America, where no distinct class of nobility exists, aristocratic feelings, and all the pride of ancestry, are at least as rampant as in England, in which the whole framework of society is constituted in reference to the ascendancy of an ancient and powerful aristocracy; and I see no reason to doubt the statement. Differences of rank were instituted when the Creator bestowed the mental organs in different degrees on different men, and rendered them all improvable by education. It is natural and beneficial, therefore, to esteem and admire Nature's nobility; men greatly gifted with the highest qualities of our nature, and who have duly cultivated and applied them. The Creator, also, in conferring on man the power to transmit, by means of his organisation, his qualities and condition to his offspring, has laid the founda-

tion for our admiration of a long line of illustrious ancestors:—This direction of ambition may become a strong assistant to morality and reason, in inducing men to attend to the organic laws in their matrimonial alliances, and in their general conduct through life. According to the doctrines expounded in a previous lecture, if two persons, of high mental and bodily qualities, were to marry, to observe the natural laws during their lives, to rear a family, and to train them also to yield steady obedience to these laws in their conduct,—the result would be, that the children would inherit the superior qualities of their parents, hold the same high rank in the estimation of society, be prosperous in life, and form specimens of human nature in its best form and condition. If these children, again, observed the organic laws in their marriages, and obeyed them in their lives, the tendency of nature would still be to transmit, in an increasing ratio, their excellent endowments to their children; and there is no ascertained limit to this series. It would be a just gratification to Self-Esteem, to belong to a family which could boast of a succession of truly noble men and women, descending through ten or twelve generations; and it would be an object of most legitimate ambition to be admitted to the honour and advantages of an alliance with it. This is the direction which the natural sentiments of family pride and admiration of ancestry will take, whenever the public intellect is enlightened concerning the laws of our constitution. In times past, we have seen these two sentiments acting as blindly and perniciously as Veneration does, when, in the absence of all true knowledge, it expends itself in preposterous superstitions. It, however, is always performing its proper function of venerating, and is ready to take a better direction when it receives illumination; and the same will hold good with the two feelings in question.

At a time when war and rapine were the distinguishing occupations of nobles, men were proud of their descent from a great warrior, perhaps a border chieftain, who was only really a thief and a robber on a great scale. At present great self-congratulation is experienced by many individuals, because they are descended from a family which received a patent of nobility five hundred years ago, and has since been maintained, by means of entails, in possession of great wealth, although during the intervening period their annals have commemorated as many prodigates, and imbeciles, as wise and virtuous men. Many commoners, also, who have inherited sound brains and respectable characters from their own obscure but excellent ancestors, are ashamed of their humble birth, and proud of an alliance with a titled family, although feeble and immoral. But all this is the result of a misdirection of Veneration and Love of Approbation, which increasing knowledge will assuredly bring to a close. It indicates an infatuation of vanity, compared with which, wearing bones in the nose, and tattooing the skin, are harmless and respectable customs. If, in a country like Britain, a family have preserved property and high social consideration for successive centuries, without a patent of nobility, and without entails, its members must have possessed sound understandings, and respectable morality; and they are, therefore, really worthy of respect: The fact that there are several (I might say many) such families, is a proof that the objects aimed at by charters of hereditary rank and entails may be better and more effectually attained by obedience to the laws of organization.

It forms no argument against these views, that in America there is as jealous a distinction of ranks, and as strong an admiration of ancestry, as in Britain; because these feelings are admitted to be na-

tural, while it is certain that the mass of American society is not better informed in regard to their proper direction, than our own countrymen. The founders of the American republic, however, were great and enlightened men, and they conferred a boon of the highest value on their posterity, when, by prohibiting artificial hereditary ranks and titles, they withdrew the temptations to misdirected ambition which they inevitably present. In America the field is left clear for the operation of reason and morality, and we may hope that, in time, ambition will take a sounder direction, corresponding with the increase of knowledge. In our own country, the law not only obstructs reason, but adds a mighty impulse to our natural liability to err.

We thus account for the fact, that the best of men do not always attain the highest stations and richest social rewards, first, by the circumstance of society being progressive,—of its being yet only in an early stage of its career, and of its honouring in every stage those qualities which it prizes most highly at the time, although they may be low in the scale of moral and intellectual excellence; and secondly, by the impediments, to a right adjustment of social honours, presented by the institution of artificial hereditary dignities and entails.

It is an interesting inquiry, Whether society is destined to remain for ever in its present or in some analogous state, or to advance to a more perfect condition of intelligence, morality, and happiness; and if the latter be a reasonable expectation, by what means its improvement is likely to be accomplished. In considering these questions, I shall attempt to dissect and represent with some minuteness, the principles which chiefly characterize our present social condition, and then compare them with our faculties, as revealed by the physiology of the brain. We shall, by this means, discover to what class of faculties our existing institutions are most directly related. If they gratify our highest powers, we may regard ourselves as having approached the limits of improvement permitted by our nature; if they do not gratify these, we may hope still to advance.

There are two views of human nature relating to this subject, both of which are plausible, and may be supported by many facts and arguments. The first is, that man is merely a superior animal, destined to draw his chief enjoyments from a regulated activity of his animal nature, adorned by such graces as are compatible with its supremacy. Life, for example, may be regarded as given to us that we may enjoy the pleasures of sense, of rearing a family, of accumulating wealth, of acquiring distinction, and also of gratifying the intellect and imagination by literature, science, and the arts. According to this view, self-interest, individual aggrandizement, and intellectual attainment, would be the leading motives of all sensible men during life; and the moral faculties would be used chiefly to control and direct these selfish propensities in seeking their gratifications, so as to prevent them from unduly injuring their neighbours, and endangering their own prosperity. There would be no leading moral object in life: our enjoyments would not necessarily depend on the happiness and prosperity of our fellow-men; and the whole duty of the higher sentiments would be to watch over and direct the lower propensities, so as to prevent them from defeating their own aims.

The other view is, that man is essentially a rational and moral being, destined to draw his chief happiness from the pursuit of objects related directly to his moral and intellectual faculties; the propensities acting merely as the servants of the sentiments, to maintain and assist them while pursuing their high and beneficent behests. History represents man, in past ages, as having been ever in the former condi-

tion; either openly pursuing the gratification of the propensities, as the avowed and only object of life, or merely curbing them so far as to enable him to obtain higher satisfaction from them, but never directly pursuing moral ends or universal happiness as the chief object of his existence. This also is our present condition.

Even in civilized communities, each individual who is not born to hereditary fortune, must necessarily enter into a vivid competition for wealth, power, and distinction, with all who move in his own sphere. Life is spent in one incessant struggle. We initiate our children into the system, at the very dawn of their intelligence. We place them in classes at school, and offer them marks of merit, and prizes to stimulate their ambition; and we estimate their attainments, not by the extent of useful knowledge which they have gained, but according to the place which they hold in relation to their fellows. It is proximity to the station of dux that is the grand distinction, and this implies the marked inferiority of all below the successful competitor.

On entering into the business of life, the same system is pursued. The manufacturer taxes his invention and his powers of application to the utmost, that he may outstrip his neighbours in producing better and cheaper commodities, and reaping a greater profit than they; the trader keeps his shop open earlier and later, and promises greater bargains than his rival, that he may attract an increased number of customers. If a house is to be built, or a steam-engine fitted up, a specification, or a minute description of the object wanted, is drawn up; copies are presented to a number of tradesmen; they make offers to execute it for a certain sum, and the lowest offerer is preferred. The extent of difference in these offers is enormous. I was one of several public commissioners, who received offers for building a bridge, the highest of which amounted to L.21,036, and the lowest to L.13,749. Of six offers which I received for building a house, the highest was L.1975, and the lowest L.1500. Differences equally great have been met with in tenders for furnishing machinery and works of various kinds. I have made inquiries to ascertain whence these differences arose, and found them accounted for by the following causes:—Sometimes an offer is made by a tradesman who knows himself to be insolvent; who, therefore, has nothing to lose; but who is aware that the state of his affairs is not publicly known, so that his credit is still good. As long as he can proceed in trade, he obtains the means of supporting and educating his family, and every year passed in accomplishing this object is so much gained. He can preserve his trade only by obtaining a regular succession of employment, and he secures this by under-bidding every man who has a shilling of capital to lose. Bankruptcy is the inevitable end of this career, and the men who have property ultimately sustain the loss arising from this unjust and pernicious course of action; but it serves the purpose for a time, and this is all that the individual who pursues it regards. Another and a more legitimate cause of low bidding is the reverse of this. A trader has accumulated capital, and buys every article at the cheapest rate with ready money;—he is frugal, and spends little money in domestic expenses; he is active and sharp in his habits and temper, and exacts a great deal of labour from his workmen in return for their wages. By these three circumstances combined, he is enabled to underbid every rival who is inferior to him in any one of them. I am informed that the cost of production to a master-tradesman thus qualified, compared with that to one in other circumstances and of more expensive habits and lax dispositions, differs to the extent of from 15 to 20 per cent.

Viewed on the principle that the object of life is self-aggrandizement, all this order of proceeding appears to be proper and profitable. But if you trace out the moral effects of it, they will be found extremely questionable.

The tendency of the system is to throw an accumulating burden of mere labour on the industrious classes. I am told that in some of the great machine-manufactories in the west of Scotland, men labour for sixteen hours a-day, stimulated by additions to their wages in proportion to the quantity of work which they produce. Masters who push trade on a great scale, exact the most energetic and long-continued exertion from all the artisans whom they employ. In such circumstances, man becomes a mere labouring animal. Excessive muscular action drains off the nervous energy from his brain; and when labour ceases sleep ensues, unless the artificial stimulus of intoxicating liquors be applied, as it generally is in such instances, to rouse the dormant mental organs and confer a temporary enjoyment. To call a man who passes his life in such a routine of occupation—eating, sleeping, labouring, and drinking—a Christian, an immortal being, preparing, by his exertions here, for an eternity hereafter, to be passed in the society of pure, intelligent, and blessed spirits,—is a complete mockery. He is preparing for himself a premature grave, in which, benumbed in all the higher attributes of his nature, he shall be laid exhausted with toil, more like a jaded and ill-treated horse than a human being. Yet this system pervades every department of practical life in these islands. If a farm be advertised to be let, tenants compete with each other in bidding high rents, which, when carried to excess, can be paid only by their converting themselves and their servants into labouring animals, bestowing on the land the last effort of their strength and skill, and resting satisfied with very little enjoyment from it in return.

By the competition of individual interests, directed to the acquisition of property and the attainment of distinction, the practical members of society are not only powerfully stimulated to exertion, but actually forced to submit to a most jading, laborious, and endless course of toil; in which neither time, opportunity, nor inclination, is left for the cultivation and enjoyment of the higher powers of the mind.

The order and institutions of society are framed in harmony with this principle. The law prohibits men from using force and fraud in order to acquire property, but sets no limits to their employment of all other means. Our education and mode of transacting mercantile business, support the same system of selfishness. It is an approved maxim, that secrecy is the soul of trade; and each manufacturer and merchant pursues his speculations secretly, so that his rivals may know as little as possible of the kind and quantity of goods which he is manufacturing, of the sources whence he draws his materials, or the channels by which he disposes of his products. The direct advantage of this system is, that it confers a superiority on the man of acute and extensive observation and profound sagacity. He contrives to penetrate many of the secrets which are attempted, though not very successfully, to be kept; and he directs his own trade and manufacture, not always according to the current in which his neighbours are floating, but rather according to the results which he foresees will take place from the course which they are following; and then the days of their adversity become those of his prosperity. The general effect of the system, however, is, that each trader stretches his capital, his credit, his skill, and his industry, to produce the utmost possible quan-

tity of goods, under the idea, that the more he manufactures and sells, the more profit he will reap. But as all his neighbours are animated by the same spirit, they manufacture as much as possible also; and none of them knows certainly how much the other traders in his own line are producing, or how much of the commodity in which he deals the public will really want, pay for, and consume, within any specific time. The consequence is, that a superfluity of goods is produced; the market is glutted; prices fall ruinously low,—and all the manufacturers who have proceeded on credit, or who have limited capital, become bankrupt, and the effects of their rash speculations fall on their creditors. They are, however, excluded from trade for a season,—the other manufacturers restrict their operations; the operatives are thrown idle, or their wages are greatly reduced. The surplus commodities are at length consumed, demand revives, prices rise, and the rush towards production again takes place; and thus in all trades the pendulum oscillates, generation after generation, first towards prosperity, then to the equal balance, then towards adversity,—back again to equality, and once more to prosperity.

The ordinary observer perceives in this system what he considers to be the natural, the healthy, and the inevitable play of the constituent elements of human nature. He discovers many advantages attending it, and some evils; but these he regards as inseparable from all that belongs to mortal man. The competition of individual interests, for example, he assures us, keeps the human energies alive, and stimulates all to the highest exercise of their bodily and mental powers; whence abundance of every article that man needs, is poured into the general treasury of civilized life, even to superfluity. We are all interested, he continues, in cheap production; and although we apparently suffer by an excessive reduction in the prices of our own commodities, the evil is transitory, and the ultimate effect is unmixed good, for all our neighbours are running the same career of over-production with ourselves. While we are reducing our shoes to a ruinously low price, the stocking-maker is doing the same with his stockings, and the hat-maker with his hats; and after we all shall have exchanged article for article, we shall still obtain as many pairs of stockings, and as many hats, for any given quantity of shoes, as ever; so that the real effect of competition is to render the nation richer, to enable it to maintain more inhabitants, or to provide for those it possesses more abundantly, without rendering any individuals poorer. The evils attending the rise and fall of fortunes, the heartbreaking scenes of bankruptcy, and the occasional degradation of one family and elevation of another, they regard as storms in the moral, corresponding to those in the physical world; which, although inconvenient to the individuals whom they overtake, are, on the whole, beneficial, by stirring and purifying the atmosphere: and, regarding this life as a mere pilgrimage to a better, they view these incidental misfortunes as means of preparation for a higher sphere.

This representation has so much of actual truth in it, and such an infinite plausibility, that it is somewhat adventurous to question its soundness; yet I am forced to do so, or to give up my best and brightest hope of human nature and its destinies. In making these remarks, of course I blame no individuals; it is the course of action which I condemn. Individuals are as much controlled by the social system in which they live, as a raft is by the current in which it floats.

In all the systems which I have described, you will discover no motives higher than those furnished

by the propensities regulated by justice, animating the competing members of society in their evolutions. The grand object of each is to gain as much wealth, and, as its consequence, as much power and distinction to himself as possible; he pursues this object without any direct regard to his neighbour's interest or welfare; and no high moral or intellectual aim elevates, ennobles, or adorns his career. The first effect is, that he dedicates his whole powers and energies to the production of the mere *means of living*, and he forces all his fellows to devote their lives to precisely the same pursuits. If leisure for moral and intellectual cultivation be necessary to the enjoyment of a rational, a moral, and a religious being, this is excluded; for the labour is incessant during six days of the week, the effect of which is to benumb his faculties on the seventh. If the soft play of the affections; if the enjoyment of the splendid loveliness of nature and the beauties of art; if the expansion of the intellect in the pursuits of science; if refinement of manners; if strengthening and improving the tone and forms of our physical frames; and if the adoration, with minds full of knowledge and souls melting with love, of our most bounteous Creator, constitute the real objects of human life in this world—the end for which we live; and if the fulfilment of this end be the only rational idea of preparation for a higher state of existence; then the system of action which we have contemplated, when viewed as the leading object of human life, appears stale, barren, and unprofitable. It no doubt supports the activity of our minds and bodies, and surrounds us with innumerable temporal advantages, not to be lightly valued; but its benefits end there. It affords an example of the independence of the several natural laws. The system is one in which the mind and body are devoted for ten or twelve hours a-day, on six days in the week, to the production of those useful and ornamental articles which constitute wealth; and in this object we are eminently successful. Verily we have our reward; for no nation in the world possesses so much wealth as Britain; none displays such vast property in the possession of individuals; none approaches her in the general splendour of living; and none in the multitude of inhabitants who live in idleness and luxury on the accumulated fruits of industry. But still, with all the dazzling advantages which Britain derives from her wealth, she is very far from being happy. Her large towns are overrun with pauperism and heathenism; and in many English counties, even the agricultural population has lately been engaged in burning corn-stacks and farm-offices, out of sheer misery and discontent. The overwrought manufacturers are too frequently degraded by intemperance, licentiousness, and other forms of vice. In the classes distinguished by industry and morality, the keen competition for employment and profit imposes excessive labour and anxiety on nearly all; while the higher classes are often the victims of idleness, vanity, ambition, vice, ennui, and a thousand attendant sufferings of body and mind. The pure, calm, dignified, and lasting felicity which our higher feelings pant for, and which reason whispers ought to be our aim, is seldom or never attained.

The present condition of society, therefore, does not seem to be the most perfect which human nature is capable of reaching: hitherto man has been progressive, and there is no reason to believe that he has yet reached the goal. In the next lecture will be stated some grounds for expecting brighter prospects in future.

LECTURE X.

THE CONSIDERATION OF THE PRESENT AND PROSPECTIVE CONDITION OF SOCIETY CONTINUED.

Additional examples of bad results of competition of individual interests—Disadvantages attending the division of labour—Difficulty of benefiting one individual without injuring others—Instance of charitable institutions—Question, Whether the destruction of human life or of corn is the greater public calamity?—State of the Irish peasantry—Impediments to the abandonment of luxuries by the Irish—The leading arrangements of society at present bear reference to self-interest—Christianity cannot become practical while this continues to be the case.—Does human nature admit of such improvement, that the evils of individual competition may be obviated, and the moral sentiments rendered supreme?—Grounds for hope—Natural longing for a more perfect social condition—Schemes of Plato, Sir T. More, the Primitive Christians, the Harmonites, and Mr Owen.

I proceed to point out some additional examples of the results of the competition of individual interests.

Apparently the evils of the selfish system have the tendency to prolong and extend themselves indefinitely. We have seen, for example, that the institution of different employments is natural, springing from differences in native talent and inclination. This leads to the division of labour, by which every person has it in his power to confine his exertions to that species of art for which he has the greatest aptitude and liking; while, by interchanging commodities, each may acquire the things necessary to his own enjoyment. But under the present system, this institution is attended with considerable disadvantages. Workmen are trained to perform the minute portions of labour on a particular article, and to do nothing else: one man can point a pin, and do no more; another can make the pin's head, but can finish no other part of it; one can make the eye of a needle, but can neither fashion the body, nor point it. In preparing steam-engines, there are different branches of trade, and different workshops for the different parts of the machine. One person makes boilers, another casts the framework and heavy iron-beams, a third makes cylinders, a fourth pistons, and so on; and the person who furnishes steam-engines to the public, merely goes to these different work-shops, buys the different parts of the skeleton, and his own trade consists in fitting them together, and selling the engine entire.

These arrangements produce commodities better and cheaper, than if one man made the whole needle or pin, or one manufactory fabricated the whole steam-engine; but when we view the system in its moral effects, there is an attendant disadvantage. It rears a large number of workmen, who are ignorant of every practical art beyond the minute details of their own branch of industry, and who are altogether useless and helpless, except when combined under one employer. If not counteracted in its effects by an extensive education, it renders the workmen incapable of properly discharging their duties as parents, or members of society, by leaving them ignorant of every thing except their narrow mechanical operations. It leaves them also exposed, by ignorance, to become the dupes of political agitators and fanatics, and makes them dependent on the capitalist. Trained from infancy to a minute operation, their mental culture neglected, and destitute of capital they are incapable of exercising sound judgment on any subject, and of combining their labour and their skill for the promotion of their own advantage. They are, therefore, mere implements of trade in the hands of men of more enlarged minds and more extensive property; and as these men also compete

keenly, talent against talent, and capital against capital, each of them is compelled to throw back a part of the burden on his artizans, demanding more labour, and giving less wages, to enable him to maintain his own position.*

Nor does the capitalist escape the evils of the system. In consequence of manufacturer competing with manufacturer, and merchant with merchant, who will execute most work, and sell his goods cheapest, profits fall extremely low, and the rate of interest, which is just the proportion of profit corresponding to the capital employed in trade, becomes depressed. The result is, that the artizan's wages are lowered to the verge of a decent subsistence, earned by his utmost exertions; the manufacturer and merchant are exposed to incessant toil and risk, and are moderately recompensed; and the capitalist, who desires to retire from active business, and live on the produce of his previous industry, in the form of interest, participates in their depression, and starves on the smallest pittance of annual return. Thus, selfish competition presents the anomaly of universal abundance co-existing with individual want, and leads to a ceaseless struggle to obtain objects fitted chiefly to gratify our inferior powers.

While the competition of individual interest continues to prevail in society, the field even of Benevolence itself is limited. It becomes difficult to do good to one individual, or class of individuals, without doing an injury to others. Nothing, for example, can at first sight appear more meritorious and beneficial, than the institution of such charitable endowments as that of Heriot's Hospital, or the hospitals founded by the two Watsons, of this city; in which children of decayed or deceased parents, belonging to the industrious classes, are educated, provided for, and set out in life. Yet objections to them have been stated, on very plausible grounds. According to the principles which I have endeavoured to expound in the preceding lectures, children do not, in general, become destitute, except in consequence of great infringement of one or more of the natural laws, by their parents. If the parents died prematurely, they must, in most cases (for accidents will happen, even with the utmost care), have inherited feeble constitutions, or disobeyed, in their own persons, the organic laws; and the destitution of their children is the natural consequence of these causes. If the father have been in trade, have failed, and fallen into poverty, he must have been deficient in some important qualities or habits necessary to success. Now, amidst the competition of individual interests, there is always a considerable number of meritorious persons, who stand in the middle line between high and low endowments, who with great difficulty are able to maintain themselves and their families in the station, in which they were born, and who succeed in doing so, only by submitting to incessant toil, and great sacrifices of enjoyment. I have heard such persons make remarks like the following:—"Do you see that young man?—he was educated in Heriot's Hospital, and, by the influence of the managers of that institution, was received as an apprentice into a thriving mercantile establishment, into which I had in vain endeavoured to get one of my sons introduced. He is now head-clerk. Well! benevolence is not always justice:—that boy's father was sporting his horse and gig, and living like a gentleman, while I was toiling

and saving;—he fell from his gig and broke his neck, when he had drunk too much wine. At his death, his affairs were found to be in bankruptcy; but he had good friends; his children were taken into the hospital, and here you see the end of it;—his boy comes out of the charity better educated than my sons; and, supported by the influence of the managers, he prevents mine from getting into a good situation, by stepping into it himself:—this, I say, may be benevolence, but it is not justice." This is not an imaginary dialogue; I have heard the argument stated again and again, and I could never see a satisfactory answer to it. It would be cruelty to abandon the children, even of the victims of such misconduct as is here described, to want, crime, and misery; yet surely there must be some defect in the leading principle of our social institutions, when a benevolent provision for them really has the effect of obstructing the path and hindering the prosperity of the children of more meritorious individuals.

I have heard this line of argument pushed still farther. An acute reasoner often maintained in my presence, that if one hundred unmarried men, and one thousand quarters of wheat, were both in one ship, the loss of the men would be no public evil, while the loss of the wheat would be a real one. He maintained his position by arguing that, in this country, the competition for employment is so great, that the removal of one hundred individuals from any branch of labour would only benefit those who were left, by rendering the competition less arduous, and their remuneration greater; whereas the loss of one thousand quarters of wheat would necessarily lead to diminution of the diet of a certain number of the poorest of the people. All the wheat which we possess, he said, is annually consumed; if it be abundant, it is cheap, and the poor get a larger share: if it be scarce, it is dear, and the deficiency falls upon the poor exclusively: the loss even of one thousand quarters, therefore, would have stinted the poor, it may be only to a fractional, but still to a real extent, sufficient to establish the principle contended for; so that, continued my friend, British society is actually in that condition in which the loss of food is a greater public calamity than the loss of men.

This argument appears to me to be sound in principle, although wire-drawn. The answer to it is, that our benevolent feelings, which, although obstructed under the selfish system, are not extinguished, would receive so much pain from seeing one hundred human beings deprived of the pleasures of existence, that even the poor would cheerfully sacrifice many meals to contribute to their preservation. If the events be contemplated apart from the pain or gratification which our benevolent feelings experience from them, and if the amount of good and evil, not to the one hundred sufferers, but to the community at large, be solely regarded, the loss of men, in a country like this, does appear a smaller misfortune than the loss of food. Ireland affords a striking illustration. There is more of benevolent arrangement in the tendency of barbarous tribes to wage furious wars with each other, than at first sight appears. The Irish peasantry, in general, were till lately barbarous in their minds and habits, and, but for the presence of a large army of civilized men, who preserved the peace, they would have fought with, and slain, each other. It is questionable whether the miseries that would have attended such a course of action, would have exceeded those which are actually endured from starvation. The bane of Ireland is, that, owing to England keeping the peace, her population has increased far more rapidly than her capital, morality, and knowledge. Where a nation is left to follow its own course, this does not occur. While it is ignorant and barbarous, it is

* I confine the observations in the text to the case of mechanics who are uneducated. If they receive a good education, the more monotonous their employment is, they have the more spare energy for thought. Weavers who have once entered on reading, generally become intelligent, for their labour absorbs a small portion of mind; but if they have not been educated at all, they become dull and stupid, or unsettled and vicious.

pugnacious, reckless, licentious, and intemperate, qualities which naturally restrain or destroy population; and it is only after morality and intelligence have been introduced, that capital and industry follow, and population naturally and beneficially increases. England prevented the Irish from fighting, but she did little to improve their moral, intellectual, and physical condition. The consequence has been, as the purest philanthropist will confess, that a destroying angel, who in one night should slay a million of human beings, men, women, and children, in that country, would probably occasion less suffering, than would arise from any considerable deficiency in their potato crop. I see it mentioned in the newspapers, that at this moment (June 1835) the peasantry in the west of Ireland are suffering all the horrors of famine through failure of that portion of their food.* Although corn is abundant, and is daily exported to England, they are too poor to purchase it. The Irish peasantry, habitually on the brink of starvation, and exposed to the greatest destitution, stand at one end of the agricultural scale; and the great landed proprietors of England, with revenues of £100,000 per annum, and rolling in every kind of luxury, occupy the other. The hand-loom weavers of Britain, earning five shillings a-week by the labour of six days, of fourteen hours each, are at the base of the manufacturing pyramid; while the Peels and Arkwrights, possessing millions of pounds, appear at the summit. There is something *not* agreeable to our moral sentiments, and *not* conformable to the brother-loving and wealth-despising precepts of Christianity, in a system of which these are the natural fruits, and according to which, even benevolence cannot be manifested towards one human being without indirectly doing injury to another.

Another example of the solidity and consistency of the prevailing system may be noticed. Many persons imagine that there is no social obstacle to the rich leaving off their vanities and luxuries, and dedicating their surplus revenues to moral and religious purposes; on the contrary, that great good would result from their doing so; but the consequences, even of this virtuous measure, would, while the present system endures, prove highly detrimental to thousands of meritorious traders. Multitudes of laborious and virtuous families subsist by furnishing materials for the luxuries of the rich, and a change in the direction of their expenditure would involve these families in misfortune. Fluctuations in fashion, as taste varies, often occasion great temporary suffering to this class of the community, and a total abandonment of all luxurious indulgences, on the part of the wealthy, would involve them in irretrievable ruin.

We perceive, therefore, that the general arrangements of our existing social system, evidently bear reference to the supremacy of our lower faculties. The pursuit of wealth at present generally ends in the gratification of Self-Esteem and Love of Approbation. The attainment of power and distinction in politics, in rank, or in fashion, is the Alpha and Omega of our social machinery; yet it does not produce general happiness. Every moral, and I may almost say religious, advantage is incidental to, and not a part of, the system itself. There are laws to compel us to pay taxes for the maintenance of officers of justice, whose duty it is to punish crime after it is committed; but there are no general laws to prevent crime by means of penitentiaries and of abundant and instructive schools.† There are laws

which tax us to support armies and navies for the purpose of fighting our neighbours; but no laws compel us to pay taxes for the purpose of providing, in our great cities, the humblest luxuries, nay almost necessities for the indigent, such as medical hospitals, to receive them when in disease, or baths to preserve them in health, or reading-rooms, or places of instruction and amusement, in which their rational faculties may be cultivated and their comfort promoted, after their days of toil are finished. There are taxes to maintain the utterly destitute and miserably poor after they have fallen into that condition, but none to provide means for arresting them in their downward progress towards it. In short, the system, as one of self-interest, is wonderfully perfect. From the beginning to the end of it, prizes are held out to the laborious, intelligent, and moral, who choose to dedicate their lives, honestly and fairly, to the general scramble for property and distinction; while every facility is afforded to those less favourably constituted, who are incapable of maintaining the struggle, to sink to the lowest depths of wretchedness and degradation. When they have reached the bottom, and are helpless and completely undone, the hand of a meagre charity is stretched forth to support life, till disappointment, penury, or old age, consign them to the grave. The taxes occasioned by our national and immoral wars, render us unable to support imposts for moral objects.

It is worthy of remark, that if the system of individual aggrandizement be the necessary, unalterable, and highest result of the human faculties, as constituted by nature, it altogether excludes the possibility of Christianity ever becoming practical in this world. The leading and distinguishing moral precepts of Christianity are those which command us to do to others as we would wish that they should do unto us; to love our neighbours as ourselves; and not to permit our minds to become engrossed in the pursuit of wealth, or infatuated by the vanity and ambition of the world. But if a constant struggle for supremacy in wealth and station be unavoidable among men, it is clearly impossible for us to obey such precepts, which must therefore be as little adapted to our nature and condition, as the command to love and protect poultry, but never to eat them, would be to that of the fox. Instead, therefore, of divines teaching Christian morality (if the system of competition of individual interests be the highest that our nature admits of), it would be wiser in them to follow the example of the political economists, and to suit their precepts to the human constitution. Political economists in general regard the existing forms and condition of society as the result of our natural faculties, and as destined to be the lot of man to the end of time. In perfect consistency with this view, they propose to provide for the increasing welfare of the race, by exalting the aim of the selfish principles, and directing them more beneficially by extended knowledge. They would educate the operative classes, and thereby confer on them mental energy, fortitude, and a rational ambition—after which it might be expected that they would not consent to labour, like the lower animals, merely for the humblest subsistence; but would consider decent comforts, if not simple luxuries, essential to their enjoyment, and demand wages adequate to the command of these, as the recompence of their industry and skill. As long, however, as the system of individual aggrandizement is maintained, it will be the interest of the class immediately above the operatives, and who subsist on the profits of their labour, to prevent the growth

and in the management of these prisons, they are greatly in advance of Britain.

* By a singular coincidence, starvation, from disease in the potato crop, is again afflicting unhappy Ireland, at the time when this edition is in the press (April 1846.)

† The United States of America are happily free from this reproach. In their provisions for National Education,

of improved notions and principles of action among them; for the labourer is in the most profitable condition for his master's service when he possesses just intelligence and morality sufficient to enable him to discharge his duties faithfully, but so little as to feel neither the ambition nor the power of effectually improving his own circumstances. And accordingly, the maintenance of the labouring classes in this state of contentment and toil, is the *beau idéal* of practical philosophy with many excellent individuals in the higher and middle ranks of life.

Under this system, the aim of the teacher of morality and religion is to render the operative classes quiet and industrious labourers, toiling patiently through this life in poverty and obscurity, and looking forward to heaven as their only place of rest and enjoyment. Under the selfish system, religion and morality do not aspire to the establishment on earth of the truly Christian condition—that in which each individual finds his neighbour's happiness an essential element of his own; in which he truly loves his neighbour as himself; and in which labour and the attainment of wealth are not the ends or objects of existence, but simply the means of enabling him to live in comfort and in leisure, to exercise habitually his moral and intellectual faculties, and to draw from these his chief enjoyments. According to the present system, the attainment of this condition is deferred till we arrive in heaven. But, if human nature be capable of realizing this state on earth, it is an error to postpone it till after death; more especially, as there is every warrant, both in reason and Scripture, for believing that every step which we shall make towards it in this life, will prove one of advance towards it in another.

It is now time, however, to enter on the consideration of the main subject of the present lecture—the question, Whether the human faculties, and their relations to external objects, admit of man ascending in the scale of morality, intelligence, and religion, to that state in which the evils of individual competition shall be obviated, and full scope be afforded for the actual supremacy of the highest powers?

On contemplating man's endowments in a general point of view, nothing would appear more simple and easy than practically to realize the general and permanent supremacy of the moral powers. We have seen that aptitude for labour is conferred on him by the Creator; and that, if enlightened in regard to his own constitution and the sources of his own welfare, he would desire to labour, for his own gratification, even independently of the reward, in the form of food, raiment, and physical abundance, which it is the means of procuring. Again, the earth, and the external world generally, are created with an admirable adaptation to his bodily and mental powers, so as to recompense him, by great rewards, for a very moderate extent of exertion in applying them to his own advantage. Further, man has been endowed with inventive and co-operative faculties, which confer on him a vast ingenuity, and render him capable of impressing, not only the inferior animals, but fire, air, earth, and water, into his service as labourers. And finally, he has received organs of Benevolence, prompting him to love all sentient beings, and to delight in their happiness; organs of Conscientiousness, desiring to see universal justice reign; organs of Ideality, which aspire after universal perfection and loveliness; with organs of Veneration, Wonder, and Hope, leading him to desire communion with God, and to rejoice in the contemplation of all that is pure, excellent, and beneficent.

With such a constitution, and placed in such cir-

cumstances, the wonder is that he has wandered in error and misery so long. Some light into the cause is afforded by Phrenology. In addition to these high moral and intellectual endowments, man possesses animal propensities, which are blind and selfish impulses. They are necessary for his sustenance, and their organs are the largest, most active, and earliest developed in his brain. They are prone to produce evil until they are directed and enlightened by his moral and intellectual powers. His ignorance of himself and of external nature, and his consequent inexperience of the happiness which he is capable of reaching, appear to have been the chief causes of his past errors; and the following among other reasons authorize us to hope for happier scenes hereafter: His propensities, although strong, are felt by all well-constituted minds to be inferior in dignity and authority to the moral and intellectual faculties. There is, therefore, in man a natural longing for the realization of a more perfect social condition than any hitherto exhibited, in which justice and benevolence shall prevail. Plato's "Republic" is the most ancient recorded example of this desire of a perfect social state. Josephus describes the sect of the Essenes, among the Jews, as aiming at the same object. The "Essenes," says he, "despise riches, and are so liberal as to excite our admiration. Nor can any be found amongst them who is more wealthy than the rest; for it is a law with them, that those who join their order should distribute their possessions among the members, the property of each being added to that of all the rest, as being all brethren."—"They reject pleasure as evil; and they look upon temperance and a conquest over the passions as the greatest virtue."—(War, ii. ch. 7.) In the days of the apostles, an attempt was made by the Christians to realize these principles, by possessing all things in common. The same end is aimed at also by the Society of Shakers and by the Harmonites of North America, and by the followers of Mr Owen in Britain: Plato's Republic, and Sir Thomas More's Utopia, which was a similar scheme, were purely speculative, and have never been tried. The word "Utopian," indeed, is usually applied to all schemes too perfect and beautiful to admit of being reduced to practice. The Essenes laboured in agriculture and in various trades, and seem to have maintained their principles in active operation for a considerable period of time. We are not told whether the primitive Christians formed themselves into an association for the purpose of producing wealth: so far as we know, however, they merely contributed their actual possessions, and then gave themselves up to religious duties; and as their stores were soon consumed, the practice ceased. The Harmonites are stated to have been a colony of Moravians united under one or more religious leaders: In their own country they had, from infancy, been taught certain religious tenets, in which they were generally agreed; they had all been trained to industry in its various branches, and disciplined in practical morality; and thus prepared, they emigrated with some little property, purchased a considerable territory in Indiana, which was then one of the back settlements of the United States, and proceeded to realize the scheme of common property and Christian brotherhood. They sustained many privations at first; but in time they built a commodious and handsome village, including a church, a school-house, a library, and baths. They cultivated the ground, and carried on various manufactures;—all laboured for the common good, and were fed and clothed by the community. They implicitly obeyed their chief pastor or leader, Mr Rapp, who exercised a mild though despotic authority over them. They lived as families

in distinct dwellings, and enjoyed all the pleasures of the domestic affections; but their minds were not agitated by ambition, nor racked by anxiety about providing for their children. The latter were early trained to industry, co-operation, and religion; and if their parents died, they were at once adopted by the community. The Harmonites were not distracted with cares about old age or sickness, because they were then abundantly provided for. There was division of labour, but no exhausting fatigue:—A fertile soil, favourable climate, and moral habits, rendered moderate exertion sufficient to provide for every want. There were natural distinctions of rank; for all were subordinate to Mr Rapp; and the individuals most highly gifted filled the most important offices, such as those of religious instructors, teachers, and directors of works, and they were venerated and beloved by the other members accordingly; but no artificial distinctions found a place. This community existed many years, enjoyed great prosperity, and became rich. Mr Owen at last appeared, bought their property, and proceeded to try his own scheme. They then retired again into the wilderness, and recommenced their career. At that time they were about two thousand in number.

Here, then, the vice and misery which prevail in common society were in a great measure excluded; and though the external circumstances of the Harmonites were peculiarly favourable, their history shews what human nature is capable of accomplishing.

The leading principle of Mr Owen is, that human character is determined mainly by external circumstances; and that natural dispositions, and even established habits, may be easily overcome. Accordingly, he invited all persons who approved of his scheme, to settle at New Harmony; but as those who acted on his invitation had been trained in the selfish system, and were, in many instances, mere ignorant adventurers, they failed to act in accordance with the dictates of the moral sentiments and intellect, and Mr Owen's benevolent scheme proved completely unsuccessful. The establishment at Orbiston, in Lanarkshire, set on foot ten years ago, by the admirers of that gentleman, fell closely under my personal observation; and there the same disregard of the principles of human nature, and the results of experience, was exhibited. About three hundred persons, very imperfectly educated, and united by no great moral or religious principle, excepting the vague idea of co-operation, were congregated in a large building; they were furnished with the use of two hundred and seventy acres of arable land, and commenced the co-operative mode of life. But their labour being guided by no efficient direction or superintendence, and there being no habitual supremacy of the moral and intellectual powers among them, animating each with a love of the public good, but the reverse,—the result was melancholy and speedy. Without in the least benefiting the operatives, the scheme ruined its philanthropic projectors, most of whom are now either in premature graves, or emigrants to distant lands; while every stone which they reared has been razed to the foundation.

These details are not foreign to the subject in hand. They prove that, while ignorance prevails, and the selfish faculties bear the ascendancy, the system of individual interests is the only one for which men are fitted. At the same time, the attempts above narrated shew that there is in the human mind an ardent aspiration after a higher, purer, and happier state of society than has ever yet been realized. In the words of Mr Forsyth, there is in some men "a passion for reforming the world;" and the success of Mr Rapp, at Harmony, shews that whenever the animal propensities can be controlled

by the strength of moral and religious principle, co-operation for the general welfare, and a vast increase of happiness, become possible. As, however, individuals are liable to be led away on this subject, by sanguine dispositions and poetical fancies, our first object should be to judge calmly whether past experience does not outweigh, in the scale of reason, these bright desires and this almost solitary example, and teach us to regard them as dangerous phantoms, rather than indications of capabilities lying dormant within us. Certainly the argument founded on experience is a very strong one; yet it does not seem to me to be conclusive—and as the question of the capabilities of human nature is one of great and preliminary importance, a statement will be given in the next lecture of the reasons which render it probable that man is still susceptible of improvement to an unascertained extent. Our opinions on this point must necessarily exercise a great influence on our ideas of social duty; and the subject is, therefore, deserving of the fullest consideration.

LECTURE XI.

THE CONSIDERATION OF THE PROSPECTIVE CONDITION OF SOCIETY CONTINUED.—DUTY OF MAINTAINING THE POOR.

Reasons for expecting future human improvement.—The brain improves with time, exercise, and the amelioration of institutions—Existing superior brains and minds prove the capability of the race—The best men are the firmest believers in man's capability of improvement—Human happiness will increase with the progress of knowledge—Ignorance still prevalent—Many of our sufferings traceable to causes removable by knowledge and the practice of morality—This exemplified in poverty, and the vicissitude and uncertainty of conditions—Means by which human improvement may be effected—The interest of individuals closely linked with general improvement and prosperity—Examples in proof of this—Extensive view of the Christian precept, that we ought to love our neighbour as ourselves—Duty of attending to public affairs—Prevention of war—Abolition of slave-trade—Imperfection of political economy in its tendency to promote general happiness—Proposal to set apart stated portions of time for the instruction of the people in their social duties, and for the discharge of them—Anticipated good effects of such a measure—Duty of endeavouring to equalise happiness—Duty of maintaining the poor—Opposite views of political economists on this subject considered—Causes of pauperism, and means of removing them—These causes not struck at by the present system of management of the poor,—but on the contrary strengthened.

I proceed to state some of the reasons which render it probable that the capacity of man for improvement is greater than experience may, at first sight, lead us to suppose.

In the first place, man is obviously progressive in the evolution of his mental powers. The moral and intellectual faculties bear a far higher sway in the social life of Europe in the present day, than they did five hundred years ago; and the development of the brain also appears to improve with time, exercise, and the amelioration of social institutions. Wherever skulls several centuries old have been disinterred, they have presented moral and intellectual organs less in size in proportion to those of the propensities, than are found in the average skulls of the modern inhabitants of the same countries. It is certain also, that, in civilized nations in general, the moral and intellectual organs are larger, in proportion to the organs of the animal propensities, than they are in savages. The skulls of civilized and savage races, in the collection of the Phrenological

Society, afford proofs of this fact.* Moreover, individuals are fitted to institute, maintain, and enjoy, a highly moral and intellectual social condition, in proportion to the predominance of the organs of the superior sentiments and intellectual powers in their brains. Many persons enjoying this combination may be found in all Christian countries. They are genuine philanthropists,—good, pious, wise, long-suffering, and charitable. They see and lament the ignorance, selfishness, blindness, and degradation of the unenlightened masses of mankind, and would rejoice in institutions that should introduce peace and good-will to men, and the love of God into every mind. If men possessing such brains exist, human nature must be capable of reaching this condition; and as we are all of the same race, and regulated by the same laws, the excellent qualities exhibited by a few cannot be said to be beyond the ultimate attainment of the majority.

Farther—As the firmest believers in man's capability of improvement are those persons who themselves possess a high moral development of brain, they are inspired, in this faith, not by a demon, but by heaven; for the moral sentiments are the God-like elements of our nature; and the very fact that these ennobling expectations are entertained by men possessing the best moral affections, affords an indication that Providence intends that they should be realized. In proportion, then, as a large development of the organs of the higher faculties becomes general, the conviction of the possibility of improvement, the desire for it, and the power of realizing it, will increase.†

Again—Man, as already mentioned, is clearly and undeniably progressive in knowledge; and this single fact authorizes us to rely with confidence on his future improvement. In proportion as he shall evolve a correct knowledge of the elements of external nature, and of his own constitution, out of the dark chaos in which they have hitherto existed, will his means of acting wisely, and advantageously for his own happiness, be augmented. If we trace in history the periods of the direst sufferings of human nature, we shall find them uniformly to have been those of the most benighted ignorance; and Phrenology confirms the records of history on this subject; it shews us that the animal organs are the largest and most active, and that, in uncultivated men, they act blindly and with terrible energy, producing misery in every form. If the progress of knowledge be destined to augment virtue and enjoyment, our brightest days must yet be in reserve; because knowledge is only at this moment dawning even on civilized nations. It has been well observed, that we who now live are only emerging out of the igno-

rance and barbarism of the dark ages; we have not yet fully escaped. This is proved by the mass of uneducated persons everywhere existing;* by the imperfect nature of the instruction usually given; and by the vast multitude of prejudices which still prevail, even in the best informed classes of society. It is, in truth, an error to believe that even modern Europe is enlightened, in any reasonable meaning of the term. A few of her ablest men are comparatively well instructed, when tried by the standards of other ages; but the wisest of them have the most forcible conviction that the field of their knowledge of nature, physical and mental, when compared with the vast regions of territory still unexplored, is as a span to the whole terrestrial globe: and as to the multitude of mankind, their ignorance is like the loftiest mountain in extent, and their knowledge as the most diminutive mole-hill. The great body of the people are uninstructed in everything deserving the name of practical science. Neither our scheme of life, the internal arrangements of our houses, the plans of our towns, our modes of industry, our habits of living, our amusements, nor even the details and forms of our religious faith and worship, have been instituted after acquiring sound and systematic views of our own nature, and its wants and capabilities. The commencement of discovery in the arts and sciences, and of the art of printing itself, are still comparatively recent: while the practical application of them to increase the intelligence and happiness of the great mass of the people, with a view to realizing Christian morality and its attendant enjoyments, has scarcely yet begun.

The external world is clearly constituted with the intention that man should exert his highest faculties, illuminated by knowledge, and that his happiness should be by that means increased. Civilized man with his numerous inventions, and his admirable command over physical and animal nature, appears almost like a God, compared with the savages of New Holland, and other helpless tribes bearing the human form, without manifesting human intelli-

* STATE OF EDUCATION IN ENGLAND.

The register of marriages in England throws an incidental light upon the state of education. The parties married sign their names, if they can write, and affix their marks, if they cannot. Judging by this criterion, it appears that, among 100 men who marry in England, the number unable to write is 33. Among 100 women, 49; and the mean of both, 41. As it is estimated that the number who marry annually is only about 3 per cent. of the persons marriageable, the data are too limited to afford sure results; but in the absence of better evidence, they are well worthy of attention. With this qualification, we give the proportions for the different sections of the country.

SCHOLARSHIP OF ENGLAND.

Of 100 of each sex who marry, the number who sign with marks is—

	Males.	Females.	Mean.
South-eastern counties, . . .	32	40	36
South-midland do.	43 *	53	48
Eastern do.	45	52	48
South-western do.	31	47	39
Western do.	40	54	47
North-midland do.	32	50	41
North-western do.	39	63	51
Yorkshire,	34	49	41
Northern do.	21	42	31
Monmouth and Wales, . . .	48	70	59
The Metropolis,	12	24	18

The fact that 41 adults out of every 100 cannot write their names, is disgraceful to England, and to the Church in particular, whose especial duty it was, either to make provision for the education of the people, or to see that it was made by the state. The Church, in its collective capacity, has in fact been always hostile to the diffusion of knowledge.—*Review of the Registrar-General's Second Annual Report of Births, Deaths, and Marriages, for England, in Scotsman of 22d August 1840.*

* Since the text was written, I have visited the United States of America, and seen large numbers of skulls of native Indians, and also living individuals of these races, and have found the statement in the text supported by this evidence. See the most authentic descriptions of these skulls in Dr Morton's *Crania Americana*; an admirable work containing 78 drawings, of the size of life, of the skulls of native American Indians, with letter-press descriptions of the mental qualities of the tribes.

† The failure of the disciples of Mr Owen, at Orbiston, in Lanarkshire, may be supposed to be a refutation of this remark; but they followed the aspirations of their moral sentiments, without consulting the dictates of enlightened intellect. They believed that the good which they strongly desired could be at once realized, by measures suggested by the mere force of the desire, without fulfilling the preliminary conditions necessary to success. They assembled a number of selfish and ignorant people, and expected that, by a few speeches and by living in a community, they could alter their mental condition, and render them in the highest degree disinterested and moral. This was irrational, and failure was the natural result; but this does not shew that wiser means might not have led to happier ends.

gence. When we survey the ingenuity and utility of our mechanical inventions, and consider the extent to which they have increased our powers of producing the necessities and elegances of life, it seems difficult to doubt that the Creator, when he bestowed on us faculties which have done so much, and are capable of accomplishing incalculably more, intended that they should augment the happiness of *all* his children: He never could have designed them to be employed merely in carrying on a vast game of hazard, in which a thousand should be losers, and only one the fortunate winner; and yet, at this moment,—when we view, on the one hand, the condition of our operative, agricultural, and manufacturing population, too generally pressed to the earth with poverty and toil; and on the other, a few men of superior talent, who, by combining the exertions, and accumulating the profits of the labour of these industrious classes, have become almost princes in fortune;—we cannot deny that, to some extent, this is the use to which discoveries in art and science have been hitherto devoted. This, I say, cannot be the ultimate design of Providence; and therefore I conclude, again, that we must be as yet only evolving our destinies; that we are now in a state of transition, and, let us hope, advancing to higher morality and more universal enjoyment.

Another reason for believing in human capability of improvement is, that imperfect as our scientific acquaintance with ourselves and with external nature at present is, we are able to trace many of our sufferings to causes which are removable by knowledge and by the practice of moral duty. The evils of sickness and premature death may, in general, and with the exception of accidents, be traced to feeble constitutions inherited from parents, or to direct disobedience of the organic laws in our own persons. If knowledge of the causes of health and disease were generally diffused, and if the sanctions of religion and of public opinion were directed towards enforcing attention to them, it is reasonable to believe that in every succeeding generation, fewer parents would produce children with feeble constitutions, and fewer adults would cause their own deaths prematurely, by ignorant infringement of these laws.

Poverty, and the consequent want of the necessities and enjoyments of life, is another vast source of human suffering. But who that contemplates the fruitfulness of the earth, and the productiveness of human labour and skill, can doubt that if a higher minded and more considerate population could be reared, who should act according to the dictates of an enlightened understanding and a sound practical morality, under wise social arrangements,—this source of suffering might also be dried up, or very greatly diminished!

Vicissitude and uncertainty of condition also afflict thousands who are placed above the reach of actual want of food and raiment; yet how much of these evils may be traced to the dark mysteriousness in which trade is generally conducted; in consequence of which, each manufacturer is often in secret ruining both himself and his neighbour by over-production, without any of them being aware that he is the source of his own and his neighbour's calamities; and how much evil may be ascribed to the grasping and gambling spirit, which prompts so many persons to engage in wild speculations, which a sound education in political economy might prevent! Evils like these appear to be to some extent avoidable, by knowledge of the principles which govern commerce, and by the practice of prudence and morality by individuals.

The last reason which I assign for believing in the capability of man for improvement, is, that he

can scarcely advance a step in knowledge and morality, without inducing a palpable amelioration of his condition. If you will trace the history of our countrymen through their various states, of savages, barbarians,—chivalrous professors of love, war, and plunder,—and of civilized citizens of the world, you will find the aggregate enjoyment of the people increased with every extension of knowledge and virtue. This is so obvious and certain, that I forbear to waste your time by proving it in detail, and only remark that we cannot reasonably suppose that the progress is destined to stop at its present and still imperfect stage.

For all these reasons, let us hope that improvement, although not boundless yet so extensive that its limits cannot be defined, lies within the reach of man, and let us proceed to consider some of the means by which it may be attained.

The first step towards realizing this object is to produce a general conviction of its possibility, which I have endeavoured, in this and the preceding lectures, to accomplish. The next is to communicate to each individual a clear perception of the advantages which would accrue to *himself* from such improvements, and a firm conviction of the impossibility of individuals in general ever attaining to the full enjoyment and satisfaction of their highest and best powers, except by means of social institutions founded on the harmonious action of all their faculties.

In support of this last proposition, I solicit your attention, for a brief space, to our helpless condition as individuals. In social and civilized life, not one of us could subsist in comfort for a day, without the aid and society of our fellow-men.* This position will perhaps be disputed by few; but the idea is general, that if we only acquire property enough, we may completely realize the happy condition so delightfully sketched by Moore, when he invokes felicity to a friend in the following words:—

“Peace be around thee wherever thou ro’st;
May life be for thee one summer day;
And all that thou wishest, and all that thou lov’st,
Come smiling around thy sunny way.”

Wealth cannot purchase such happiness as this. Have any of you, in travelling, ever lost, or broken, some ingenious and useful article which you were constantly using, purchased in London or Edinburgh; and have you, in coming to a considerable village in the country, where you felt certain that you should be able to supply your want, found that you searched for it in vain? The general inhabitants of the district had not yet adopted the use of that article; the shops contained only the things which they demanded; and you speedily discovered, that, however heavy your purse might be, you could not advance one step beyond the sphere of enjoyment of the humbler people, into whose territory you had come. Or, during a residence in the country, have you taken a longing for some particular book,—not a rare or old work, but one on an important and generally cultivated science, say Lyell's *Geology*, or Gregory's *Chemistry*,—and repaired to the circulating library of the county town? You searched the catalogue for it in vain! Perhaps you applied at the best bookseller's shop, but it was not there either. The bookseller looked into his London or Edinburgh correspondent's catalogue, found the

* Alexander Selkirk lived in solitude for four years, on the uninhabited Island of Juan Fernandez, in comfort, and even with enjoyment, after he had become accustomed to his situation; but he had a fine climate, a fertile soil, and unbounded range for action. A human being left without aid in a civilized community, would be far more helpless and miserable.

name and price at once, and offered to get the book for you by the next monthly parcel; but in the mean time you received a convincing proof that you could not, without drawing on the stores of a more scientific population, advance, even intellectually, before the general inhabitants of the county in which you were located; because the means of doing so did not exist around you. If you survey the catalogue of a country circulating library, you will find that it contains chiefly the standard novels, with the current magazines, and such voyages and travels as have acquired a general popularity. With these you must rest contented, or draw your supplies from a district more advanced in intellectual culture.

Now, the principle which is here illustrated holds good universally in social life.

If you are a parent, and see the imperfections of the prevailing system of education, you cannot amend it until a teacher and a large number of parents shall have concurred in views similar to your own, and combined in the institution of an improved seminary. Many applications have been made to me, for information where seminaries for rational education, particularly for females, were to be found; but until very recently, I could not tell; because none such, to my knowledge, existed. There are now some of these in various parts of the kingdom; but before they were instituted, individual parents were compelled, by social necessity, to place their children in schools of which they did not approve, because they could find no better. Nay, enlightened teachers have told me that their schools are arrested in their progress, and retained in arrears of their own knowledge and convictions of improvement, in consequence of the prejudices of parents rendering it unsafe for them to adopt new methods. The improved schools, so far as they exist, have been created by the enlightenment of parents and teachers, by the aid of the press, and by the general spread of knowledge.

Is any of us convinced that human life is rendered unnecessarily laborious by our present habits of competition, and does he desire to limit his hours of labour, and long ardently to enjoy more ample opportunities for exercising his moral and intellectual faculties?—he soon discovers that while his neighbours in general continue to seek their chief happiness in the pursuit of wealth, or the gratification of ambition, he can accomplish little towards realizing his moral desires. He must keep his shop open as long as they do; he must labour in his manufactory up to their full standard of time; or if he be a member of a profession, he must devote as many hours to business as they; otherwise he will be distanced in the race, and lose both his means of subsistence and his station in society. So true is this representation that, in my own day, many of the men who, without fortune, have embarked in public life—that is, who have taken the lead in public affairs, and devoted a large portion of their time to the business of the community—have ruined themselves and their families. Their competitors in trade, manufactures, or professional pursuits, were dedicating their whole energies to their private duties, while they were dividing their attention between them and the public service; and they were, in consequence, ruined in their individual fortunes, and sank into obscurity and want. Yet it is certain that the business of the state, or of a particular town or city, should receive a due portion of attention from the inhabitants.

This dependence of individuals on the condition of the social circle in which they live, extends through all the ramifications of existence. Does any individual entertain higher notions of moral and religious duty than are current in his own rank and age?

—he will find, when he attempts to carry them into practice, that he becomes an object of remark to all, and of dislike and hostility to many. Does another perceive the dangers to health and comfort, in narrow lanes, small sleeping apartments, and ill-ventilated rooms and churches, and desire to have them removed?—he can accomplish absolutely nothing, until he has convinced a multitude of his fellow-citizens of the reasonableness and advantage of his projected improvements, and induced them to co-operate in carrying them into effect. Does any of us desire to enjoy more rational public amusements than those at present at our command?—he cannot succeed, unless by operating on the understandings and tastes of thousands. Perhaps the highest social pleasure of life is that of familiar converse with moral and intelligent friends; but do we not feel that, from the limited cultivation of taste and intellect still prevalent, our social parties are too often cumbrous and formal displays of wealth and luxury, and occasions much more of ostentation than of pleasing and profitable mental excitement? It is only by a higher general education that this evil can be removed. It is the want of mental resources that causes the dull display.

But perhaps the strongest proof of the close connection between the public welfare and private interest, is afforded by the effects of any great political or commercial convulsion. In 1825-6, we saw extensive failures among bankers, merchants, and manufacturers; and how universal was the individual suffering throughout all classes! Labourers could find no employment, and the shopkeepers who depended on them had few customers, and of these many were unable to pay. The great manufacturers who supplied these classes with clothing and articles for domestic use were idle; the house proprietor suffered for want of solvent tenants, and the landed proprietor found a dull and disadvantageous market for his produce. Contrast this picture with the condition of the country when the great branches of manufacturing industry are prosperous, and how different the happiness of individuals! Thus it appears, that even under the present system of the pursuit of individual interest, the real welfare of each individual is much more closely connected with that of his neighbours than is generally recognised. This proves that a fundamental element of individual advantage is public prosperity.

According to my humble conviction, therefore, the very first lesson relative to our social duties, which should be given to the young, is to open their understandings to the great fact, that the precept of Christianity which commands us to love our neighbours as ourselves, is actually written in our individual and social constitutions, and must be practically realized before individuals can become truly prosperous and happy.

The precept has been generally interpreted to mean that we should do specific acts of kindness to the men who live locally in our neighbourhood, or who are connected with us by ties of intimacy or kindred; but, although this is unquestionably one, and a very important application of it, the principle of the precept goes much farther. It enjoins us to arrange our social institutions, and our whole practical conduct, in such a manner as to render all simultaneously, and, as nearly as may be, equally, happy; and apparently our nature has been constituted to admit of this being done with unspeakable advantage to all, whenever we shall thoroughly understand our constitution, its wants and capabilities. At present his principle is imperfectly understood, and certainly not generally acted on.

A few years ago we used to hear the maxim often repeated, that private persons had nothing to do with

public affairs; that their business was to mind their shops, their manufactories, their professions, and their families, and to leave public matters to public men. The evil consequences of the world having followed this rule in past ages, may be read in the wide aberrations of many of our laws and institutions, and of our social condition, from the standards of reason and general utility. If you will peruse the pages of history, you will find the caprices of a single sovereign often leading to wars which spread devastation and misery among millions of people. These could not have been waged if the millions of persons on whom the calamities fell had considered the public interest inseparably connected with their own, and had had courage to exercise an enlightened control over the actions of their rulers. Another instance is presented in the history of the slave-trade. It proceeded from individual rapacity, and constituted the foulest blot that ever stained the fame of Britain. It enriched a few individuals at the expense of every principle of humanity, and in defiance of every Christian precept. At no period was it approved of by the general voice of the people; but each was too busy with his private affairs to make a simultaneous and general effort to arrest its progress. At last, growing intelligence, and increasing morality, in the great body of the people, did produce this co-operation; and, after ages of crime and misery, it was extinguished, by the nation paying £20,000,000 for the freedom of the slaves. If the British people had been able earlier to insist on the cessation of this odious traffic, how much of human misery, besides the loss of the £20,000,000, would have been avoided! If we trace narrowly the great causes why our rulers have been permitted to waste the public resources, and incur the national debt, which now forms so great an impediment to public improvement, we shall find that too often the individuals of the nation were calculating the private gain which hostilities would yield to them. War created a demand for arm produce to maintain fleets and armies, for cloth to clothe them, and for iron to arm them, and so forth; and men shut their eyes to the fact that it was destroying the national resources, and that they themselves would, in the end, be forced to pay for all. Unfortunately the maxim that each of us should mind his private affairs, make gain of the public if he can, and leave public measures to public men, still reigns in too much vigour. The number of persons who take an enlightened interest in social welfare is still small: so much is this the case, that even in this course of lectures, the audience has diminished in proportion as I have left the interests of individuals, and proceeded to discuss those of the public. This indicates a humble degree of mental cultivation. One of the most certain marks of a truly enlightened mind, is the power of comprehending the dependence of our individual welfare on public prosperity. I do not mean, of course, that each of us should become a political reformer, or a conservative, or a brawler about town politics and police regulations, as if these constituted our chief business, to the neglect of our private duties. This would augment, instead of diminishing, the evils of our social condition. What I wish to enforce is, the conviction that, in the general case, our individual enjoyments are inseparably connected with those of the society in which we move; and that it is both our interest and our duty to study attentively the nature, objects, and practical results, of our social institutions; and to devote all the time and attention that may be necessary to bring them into accordance with the dictates of our higher powers.

The prevalence of these views would lead to numerous and important advantages. We should learn to regard public measures in their real rela-

tionship to general utility, and not through the distorting medium of our private interests and partialities. We should proscribe class interests as public nuisances; and believe in the incalculable power which society possesses to improve its condition whenever it chooses to act in the right direction. We should feel much more disposed than at present to promote, with our moral influence, the ascendancy of all measures calculated to lead to public good, relying on their benefitting ourselves in our social capacity. Another effect would be, that men of far higher moral and intellectual character would become candidates for offices of public trust and honour, because they would be certain of support from a moral and intelligent public. At present the busy men in all the minor departments of political and public life, are too often those who are actuated by a restless vanity, or who expect to attain some selfish end through their public influence and connections. From the general disbelief in disinterested motives, public men are at present frequently rewarded with obloquy and abuse, however zealously and uprightly they may have discharged their official duties; and this deters men of delicacy, who also entertain a strong sense of justice, from accepting official trusts. There are, fortunately, many exceptions, but I fear that there are also too many examples of the truth of this remark. The truly enlightened and disinterested shrink from the means which selfishly ambitious men employ, not only to obtain, but to wield and preserve power; and hence, the field is left too open to them. The remedy for these evils is to educate the public at large into a perception of the real nature and importance of their social interests and duties.

If I be correct in the opinion that the happiness of each individual is inseparably connected with that of the society in which he lives, and that the law that we must love our neighbour as ourselves, really means, in its extensive sense, that individual enjoyment can arise only from improved social habits and institutions,—then I shall not be thought to be guilty of extravagance, when I remark, that in times past this view has rarely, to any practical end, been pressed on the attention of society. Within the last fifty or sixty years, political economy has been discussed on philosophical principles; but the leading aim of the economists has been to demonstrate the most effectual means of increasing wealth. The very title of the first valuable work on the subject in this country, is “*The Wealth of Nations*,” by Dr Adam Smith. The principles which he expounded, it is true, are, in many respects, coincident with those which I am now advocating; and no one can value his labours, and those of his successors, such as Ricardo, McCulloch, and their followers, more highly than I do; yet it is unquestionable that the great aim of all these writers has been to clear away the rubbish that impeded the play of our selfish faculties, and to teach the advantage of repealing all laws that impede a man in following his own bent, in search of its own happiness in his own way, restrained only by the obligation that he shall not directly injure or obstruct the prosperity of his neighbour. In the infancy of civilization, the exposition of the natural laws by which wealth is created and diffused is most valuable, and these writers are worthy of all consideration as being useful in their day. But society must advance in its course. It has augmented its wealth, while many persons doubt whether the increase of happiness has, in all ranks, kept pace with that of its riches. What seems now to be wanted is, the application of principles in harmony with our whole nature, physical, animal, moral, and intellectual, calculated to lead to the gratification of all our

powers. We need to be enlightened regarding the constituent elements of our own happiness, and to pursue it, in combination, in a right direction. The gigantic efforts of Britain in war, afford an example of the prodigious power, in the form of violence, which we are capable of wielding; and if our forefathers had dedicated to the physical and mental improvement of the people, the same ardour of mind, and the same amount of treasure, which they squandered in battles between the years 1700 and 1816, what a different result would at this day have crowned their labours! If they had bestowed honours on the benefactors of the race as they have done on its destroyers, how different would have been the direction of ambition!

The next requisite for improving our social condition, is the command of time for the discharge of our social duties. One day in the week is set apart for teaching and practising our religious duties; but in that day, little instruction is communicated by our public and authorized teachers, touching the affairs of this world, and the laws by which the happiness of our social state may be best promoted. The other six days of the week are devoted to the advancement of our individual interests in the pursuit of wealth, or, as the Scripture designates it, to the collection of "the meat which perisheth." In the existing arrangements of society, our social duties do not appear to be generally recognised as incumbent on us. There are few seminaries for making us acquainted with them, and no time is allotted for the practice of them. Those unofficial individuals who discharge public duties, must either sacrifice to them the time which their competitors are devoting to their private interests, or overtask their minds and bodies by labouring when nature demands repose. With all deference to existing opinions, I should humbly propose that a specific portion of time should be set apart for teaching in public assemblies, and discharging practically our social duties, and that all private business should then be suspended. If half a day in the week were devoted to this purpose, some of the following consequences might be expected to ensue.

In the first place, the great importance of social institutions and habits to individual happiness would be brought home to all. It would be half a day dedicated to the consideration of the means by which we might practically love our neighbours as ourselves: A public recognition of the principle, as one capable of being carried into effect, would, in itself, bend many minds towards realizing it.

Secondly, such an arrangement would enable, and also excite, the people at large to turn their attention seriously to moral and social considerations, in which their true interests are so deeply involved, instead of considering it meritorious and advantageous to neglect them: and it would tend to remove a dense mass of ignorance and prejudice which offers a powerful obstacle to all improvement. If I be correct in thinking that individual men cannot realize the Christian precepts in their actions, while living in a society whose ruling motives are opposed to them, it is obvious that the rectification of our social habits is an indispensable prelude to the introduction of practical Christianity; and how can these be rectified unless by instructing the people in the means of improving them? Thus the religious community are deeply interested in promoting the plan of reformation now proposed.

Thirdly, the dedication of a specific portion of time to our social duties, would leave leisure for truly virtuous and enlightened men to transact public business, without exposing themselves to be ruined by their competitors in the race of private interest. Under the present system, the selfish are enriching themselves, while the patriotic are impoverishing

their families by discharging their public duties. But as individual morality and happiness never can be securely and permanently maintained without social improvement, it follows that some adequate means must be used to communicate to men in general a correct and elevated view of their own nature, position, interests, and duties, as rational beings, with a view to induce them to improve their social habits and institutions, as a necessary preliminary to their individual wellbeing. In the "Constitution of Man," I have endeavoured to shew that the power of abridging labour by mechanical inventions, appears to have been bestowed on man, to afford him leisure for cultivating his moral and intellectual powers; and if this idea be correct, there can be no natural obstacle to the dedication of sufficient time to the duties in question.

Perhaps the notion will present itself to many persons, that if the industrious classes were congregated to receive instruction in this manner, the result would be the formation of innumerable clubs and debating societies, in which vivacious but ignorant men would imbue the weaker brethren with discontent, and lead them into mischievous errors. This would probably happen, if a sudden adoption of the plan took place, without previous preparation. At present, ignorance of sound social principles is so prevalent, that such unions might be abused; but a young and rising generation may be prepared, by training and education, for comprehending and performing their social duties, and then leisure for the practice of them would lead only to good.

So little attention has been paid to instructing the people at large in their social duties, that I am not acquainted with a single treatise on the subject, calculated for popular use, except the 38th Number of "Chambers' Information for the People," which contains an excellent exposition of a variety of public duties; but it is necessarily limited, in comparison with the vast extent of the subject. Nay, not only has no sufficient instruction in social duties been provided for the people, but the opinion has been very generally adopted that they have no such duties to discharge, except to pay taxes, and to bear arms in the militia; and that they go out of their sphere when they turn their attention to public affairs. This appears to me to be an erroneous assumption; because the industrious classes are, if possible, more directly and seriously affected by the good or bad management of public interests than the rich; in whose hands alone it has been imagined that the discharge of social duties should be placed. The operative tradesman and small shopkeeper absolutely rise and fall with every wave of public prosperity or adversity; whereas the landed proprietor and the great capitalist are able to weather many a social storm, with scarcely a perceptible abridgement of their enjoyments.

After the people at large are enlightened, and thoroughly imbued with the love of justice and of the happiness of their neighbours, another social duty will be, to carry into practice as far as possible, and by every moral means, the equalization of the enjoyment of all—not by pulling the fortunate and accomplished down, but by elevating the condition of the inferior orders. With this view, all privileges and artificial ranks which obstruct the general welfare should be abolished; not violently but gradually; and, if possible, by inducing their possessors to give them up, as injurious to the public and not beneficial to themselves.

The next social duty which I mention, relates to the maintenance of the poor. Much diversity of opinion prevails on the causes of poverty and the remedies for it; as also on the best means of managing the poor. Many political economists have

taught that there should be no legal provision for the indigent, because the knowledge of such a resource induces the indolent and vicious to relax their own efforts to earn the means of subsistence, leads them to throw themselves unblushingly, and as a matter of right, on the public bounty, and thus operates as a direct stimulus to poverty. Other authorities have taught the very opposite doctrine, and given Ireland as an instance of unexampled destitution, arising from no legal provision existing for the poor; and it is now proposed to enact poor-laws for that country.* This proposal is based on the ground that, if the rich be not compelled to support the poor, they will abandon the whole class from which the indigent arise, and allow them to sink into the lowest depths of ignorance, misery, and degradation; whereas, if they be forced to maintain all the victims of unhappy circumstances, they will be prompted by their own interest to care for them, and promote their social improvement. Again, some political economists, of whom Dr Chalmers is the chief, regard all compulsory assessments for the poor as injurious to society, and maintain that private benevolence, if fairly left to itself, is quite adequate to provide for them. Other men, equally wise and experienced in the world, are altogether disbelievers in this alleged power of the principle of benevolence; and argue, that the only effect of relying on it, would be to permit the avaricious to escape from all contribution, and to throw the burden of maintaining the poor entirely on the benevolent, who, in general, are overwhelmed with other demands on their bounty.

Scientific knowledge of human nature, and of the influence of external circumstances on happiness, cannot be general, when such widely different doctrines, regarding a question so momentous, are supported by men of equal profundity and learning.

The view of it which is presented by the new philosophy, is the following:—

The causes of that degree of poverty which amounts to destitution, are great defects in the body or the mind of the individuals who fall into this condition, or in both. The lame, the deaf, and the blind, may be poor through bodily defects, and should be comfortably supported by the more fortunate members of society. Their numbers are not great, in proportion to those of well-constituted men, and the expense of their maintenance would not be felt as a severe tax, if they were the only burdens on the benevolence of the community. The idiotic belong to the same class. All that society can accomplish in regard to such persons is, to provide comfortably for those who exist, and to use means to limit their increase in future generations. This can be accomplished best, by instructing the community at large in the organic laws, and presenting to them every intelligible motive to obey them.

The most numerous class of destitute poor is that which springs from deficiency of size or quality in the brain, or in the intellectual region of it, not amounting to idiocy, but occasioning so much mental weakness that the individuals are not capable of maintaining their place in the great struggle of social existence. Persons so constituted often provide for their own wants, although with difficulty, during the vigorous period of their lives, and become helpless and a burden on the community in the wane of life. That the primary cause of their falling into destitution, is an imperfection in their mental organs, any one may ascertain, by qualifying himself to distinguish well-constituted from ill-consti-

tuted brains, and then going into any of the charity-workhouses and asylums for adults, and observing the heads and temperaments of their inmates. It is obvious, that teaching the organic laws, and improving the external circumstances of society, are the most feasible means for lessening in future times the numbers of these unfortunate individuals.

Another proof that physiological defects lie at the root of the evil of poverty, may be obtained by observing the temperament, and size and forms of the heads, of the children of the higher and middle classes, and comparing them with those of the children of the poor, found in the parish charity-workhouses. The latter children, with some exceptions, spring from parents who are the refuse or dregs of the community, and through whose feebleness and vices they become burdens on the parish. Their children are palpably inferior in temperament, and in size or form of brain, to the offspring of parents of the middle and higher ranks: And teachers who have been employed in the schools of the superior grades, and have afterwards taught the children of public charities, have remarked an extraordinary difference of native capacity between the two; the children of the pauper asylum being much less apt to learn.

Now, although these facts go to the root of the evil, they are generally unknown and unattended to. An accomplished manager of the poor of a parish, according to the present system, is a man who resists, to the very last extremity, every application for charity; and who, when resistance is no longer possible, obtains the greatest quantity of food and raiment for the smallest amount of money. Economy in contracts is the grand object; and those managers are covered with glory, who are able to reduce the assessment on the parish one half per cent. Without meaning at all to depreciate the advantages of economy, I remark that this mode of management reminds me of the manner in which an old relative of my own coped with the rushes which grew abundantly in one of his fields. He employed women, whom he hired at so many pence a-day, to pull them up; and if the wages of the women fell from 10d. to 6d. or 8d. a-day, he thought that he had managed the rushes to great advantage that year. But it so happened, that the rushes, like the poor, constantly reappeared, and the labour of pulling them up never came to an end. At last, this excellent person died, and his sons succeeded to the farm. The son had received a scientific education, and had heard of the chemical qualities of soil, of the various metals and minerals which are usually found incorporated with it, and of the effect of these and other circumstances on vegetation. He thus discovered that stagnant water is the parent of rushes; and when he succeeded to the farm, he cut a deep drain through a high bank, obtained declivity sufficient to cause water to flow, and then constructed drains through the field in every direction. By this means he dried the soil; the rushes disappeared, and have never since been seen there; the labour of pulling them up is saved, and the money which it cost is devoted to farther improvements.

So long as society shall neglect the causes of poverty, and omit to remove them, and so long as they shall confine their main efforts to making cheap contracts for supporting the poor, so long will they have a constant succession of indigent to maintain. Nay, there is a great tendency in their proceedings to foster the growth of the very poverty which so grievously distresses them.* I have said that the children in the charity-workhouses have generally low temperaments and inferior brains; and that these

* Since the text was written such laws have been enacted.

* See note on p. 64.

are the great parents of poverty. To prevent these children from rearing an inferior race, also bordering on pauperism, and from becoming paupers themselves in the decline of life, it would be necessary to improve, by every possible means, their defective organization. This can be done only by supplying them with nutritious diet, and paying the utmost attention to their physical and mental training. By the present system, they are fed on the poorest fare, and their training is very imperfect. They look dull, inert, heavy, and lymphatic; and are not fortified so much as they might be, against the imperfections of their natural constitutions. In point of fact, in feeding pauper children with the most moderate quantity of the coarsest and cheapest food, means are actually taken to perpetuate the evil of pauperism; for bad feeding in childhood weakens the body and mind, and consequently diminishes the power of the individuals to provide for themselves. Attention, therefore, ought to be devoted, not merely to the support of existing paupers, but also to the means of preventing another crop from springing up in the next generation. Our present system may be compared to that which the farmer would have pursued, if he had watered the field after pulling up the rushes, in order to assist nature in accomplishing a new growth.

In making these observations, I beg it to be understood that I do not blame any particular managers of the poor for their proceedings, or accuse them of neglect of duty. The principles which I am now expounding, have hitherto been unknown to these persons, and are not yet generally acknowledged by society at large. Public men, therefore, could not easily act on them. But believing them to be founded in nature, and to be highly important, I use the freedom to announce them for general consideration, in the confidence, that they will in time become practical. Whatever may be thought of these views, one fact, at all events, cannot be controverted; namely, that society has not yet discovered either the causes of poverty or the remedy; hence, I conceive the statement of new principles to be neither arrogant nor unnecessary; leaving them, as I do, to stand or fall by the result of observation and experience.*

* The preceding lecture was written and delivered in 1836, and the views of Pauperism which it contains were then generally regarded as theoretical and unfounded. Subsequent events have not only proved them to be sound, but have strongly excited public attention to the painful fact, that in Scotland pauperism has increased and is rapidly increasing. Professor Alison, in his two pamphlets "On the Management of the Poor in Scotland," has, in my opinion, demonstrated, by irrefragable evidence, that the wretched pittance doled out to the poor in this country are inadequate to their comfortable subsistence, and that a continually increasing pauperism is the actual and inevitable consequence of the deep mental depression and physical degradation in which they habitually exist. 1846.

• In England Dr Ray and Mr Tuffnell, in their admirable report, dated 1st January 1841, on "the Training School at Battersea," observe that "the pauper children assembled at Norwood, from the garrets, cellars, and wretched rooms of alleys and courts in the dense parts of London, are often sent thither in a low stage of destitution, covered only with rags and vermin; often the victims of chronic disease, almost universally stunted in their growth, and sometimes smothered with want. The low-browed and inexpressive physiognomy of malign aspect of the boys is a true index to the mental darkness, the stubborn tempers, the hopeless spirits, and the vicious habits on which the master has to work." * * * "The peculiarity of the pauper child's condition is, that his parents, either from misfortune, or indolence, or vice, have sunk into destitution. In many instances children descend from generations of paupers. They have been born in the worst purlieus of a great city, or in the most wretched hovels on the parish waste. They have

LECTURE XII.

PAUPERISM AND CRIME.

Causes of pauperism continued—Indulgence in intoxicating liquors—Causes producing love of these;—Hereditary predisposition; Excessive labour with low diet; Ignorance—Effects of commercial convulsions in creating pauperism—Duty of supporting the poor—Evils resulting to society from neglect of this duty—Removal of the causes of pauperism should be aimed at—Legal assessments for the support of the poor advocated—Opposition to new opinions is no reason for despondency, provided they are sound—Treatment of criminals—Existing treatment and its failure to suppress crime—Light thrown by Phrenology on this subject—Three classes of combinations of the mental organs, favourable, unfavourable, and middling—Irrisible proclivity of some men to crime—Proposed treatment of this class of criminals—Objection as to moral responsibility answered.

In the immediately preceding Lecture, I entered upon the consideration of the social duty of providing for the poor. The removal of the causes of pauperism, it was observed, should be aimed at, as well as the *alleviation of the misery* attending it. One great cause of pauperism mentioned was bodily and mental defect; and it was held that those thus afflicted should be maintained by society.

Another cause of pauperism, is the habit of indulging in intoxicating liquors. This practice undermines the health of the whole nervous system, through which it operates most injuriously on the mind. The intoxicating fluid, by its influence on the nerves of the stomach, stimulates the brain, and excites the organs of sensibility, emotion, and thought, for the time, into pleasing and vivacious action. Hence the drunkard enjoys a momentary happiness; but when the stimulus is withdrawn, the tone of the system sinks as far below the healthy state, as during intoxication it was raised above it. He then experiences an internal void, a painful prostration of strength and vivacity, and a strong craving for a renewed supply of alcohol to recruit his exhausted vigour. During intoxication, the brain, from over excitement, is incapable of healthy action, while in the intervals between different debauches, it is so exhausted and enfeebled, that it is equally unfit to execute its functions. The habitual drunkard thus sinks into the condition of an imbecile, and may become a burden on the industrious portion of the community for his maintenance.*

suffered privation of every kind." * * * "They have seen much of vice and wretchedness, and have known neither comfort, kindness, nor virtue." P. 202-3. These gentlemen recommend, and have instituted, a mode of treatment calculated to remove these causes of pauperism. 1842.

Since these notes were published, a new poor-law for Scotland has been enacted and come into operation, calculated to provide more adequate sustenance for the poor: but the principles advocated in the text can scarcely be said to be recognised by those who are charged with carrying it into execution. 1846.

* The phenomena attending the different stages of intoxication appear to indicate that the brain is affected also directly in the following manner, although evidence is still wanting to render this view certain: Intoxicating liquors accelerate the action of the heart, and cause an increased flow of blood to the head. The first effect of this is to stimulate all the organs into greater activity, and to produce feelings of vivacity and pleasure. The blood circulates most freely in the largest mental organs, because they have the largest bloodvessels. As intoxication proceeds, the smaller organs—those of the intellectual powers—are first overcharged with blood, and their functions become impaired; next, the organs of the moral sentiments are gorged; and lastly, those of the propensities; so that the drunkard extinguishes first his humanity, then his animal nature, and at last becomes a mere breathing unconscious mass.

Various causes lead to these unfortunate habits. One is hereditary predisposition. If the parents, or one of them, have been habitually addicted to this vice, its consequences affect their physical constitution, and they transmit an abnormal condition of organization to their children. This doctrine has been ridiculed, as if we taught that children are born drunk. They are no more born drunk than they are born in a passion; but they are engendered with conditions of brain that tend ultimately to produce in them a love of intoxicating fluids.

Again, a tendency to drunkenness appears to be caused by excessive labour with low diet. The nervous energy is exhausted through the medium of the muscles, and the stimulus of alcohol is felt to be extremely grateful in restoring sensations of life, vigour, and enjoyment. This cause may be removed by moderating the extent of labour, and improving the quantity or the quality of the food. If alcohol were withheld, and a nourishing diet supplied to such men, they would, after a few weeks, be surprised at the pleasurable feelings which they would experience from this better means of supplying the waste of their systems.

An additional cause of intoxication is found in ignorance. When an individual enjoys high health and a tolerably well-developed brain, he feels a craving for enjoyment; a desire to be happy, and to be surrounded by happy friends. If he be uneducated and ignorant, his faculties want a scene in which they may vent their vivacity, and objects on which they may expend their energies; and he discovers that intoxicating liquors will give him a vivid experience, for the time, of the pleasures of which he is in quest. For the sake of this artificial stimulus, the bottle is then resorted to, instead of the natural excitements of the mind, calculated at once to render us happy, and to improve our external condition. This was the real source of the drunkenness which disgraced the aristocracy of Britain in the last generation. I am old enough to have seen the last dying disgraces of that age. The gentlemen were imperfectly educated, had few or no intellectual resources, and betook themselves to drinking as a last resource, for the sake of enjoying the pleasures of mental vivacity. From an analogous cause, some legal and medical practitioners, who reside in the provinces, fall into these pernicious habits. Their limited sphere of duties does not afford a constant stimulus to their minds, and they apply to the bottle to eke out their enjoyments.

A more extensive and scientific education is the most valuable remedy for these evils. We have seen mental cultivation banish drunkenness from the classes holding rank and respectability in society, and the same effect may be expected to follow from the extension of education downwards.

The last cause of pauperism is a great convulsion which occurs every few years in our manufacturing and commercial systems, and which, by deranging trade, deprives many industrious individuals of employment, casts them on charity for subsistence, breaks down their self-respect and feelings of independence, and ultimately degrades them into helpless pauperism.

If, then, I am correct in the opinion, that the chief causes of pauperism are—*first*, a low temperament, and imperfect development of brain, attended with a corresponding mental imbecility, although not so great as to amount to idiocy;—*secondly*, hereditary or acquired habits of intoxication, which impair the mind by lowering the tone of the whole nervous system;—*thirdly*, want of mental cultivation; and *fourthly*, depression arising from commercial disasters—the question, Whether the poor should be provided for by society, is easily solved. To leave

them destitute would not remove any one of these causes, but increase them. To allow our unhappy brethren, who thus appear to be as frequently the victims of evil influences over which they have little or no control, as of their own misconduct, to perish, or to linger out a miserable and vicious existence, would be not only a direct infringement of the dictates of Benevolence and Conscientiousness, but an outrage on Veneration (seeing that God has commanded us to assist and reclaim them): Moreover, it would tend also to the injury of our own interests.

The fact that the world is arranged by the Creator on the principle of dispensing happiness to the community in proportion to their obedience to the moral law, is here again beautifully exemplified. By neglecting the poor, the number of individuals possessing deficient brains and temperaments is increased; the number of drunkards is increased; and the number of the ignorant is increased; and as society carries these wretched beings habitually in its bosom; as they prowl about our houses, haunt our streets, and frequent our highways, and as we cannot get rid of them, it follows, that we must suffer in our property and in our feelings, until we do our duty towards them. Nay, we must suffer in our health also; for their wretchedness is often the parent of epidemic diseases, which do not confine their ravages to them, but sweep away indiscriminately the good and the selfish, the indolent and the hard-hearted, who have allowed the exciting causes to grow up into magnitude beside them.*

On the other hand, by applying rigorous measures not only to maintain the poor, but to remove the causes of pauperism, these evils may be mitigated, if not entirely removed. If a practical knowledge of the organic laws were once generally diffused through society, and a sound moral, religious, and intellectual education were added, I cannot doubt that the causes of pauperism would be perceptibly diminished. Phrenology conveys a strong conviction to the mind that precepts or knowledge are not sufficient by themselves to ensure correct conduct. The higher faculties of the mind must be brought into a state of sufficient vigour to be able practically to resist, not only the internal solicitations of the animal propensities, but the temptations presented by the external world, before sound precepts can be realized in practice. Now, a favourable state of the organs, on the condition of which mental strength or feebleness in this world depends, is an indispensable requisite towards the possession of this vigour; and as this fact has not hitherto been known,—at least, has not been attended to,—it seems to me pro-

* I have already adverted, on p. 64, to the destitute condition of the poor, and its tendency to cause the increase of pauperism. Professor Alison, in his pamphlet "On the Management of the Poor in Scotland," has shewn that another of the consequences of their extreme want, is the prevalence of epidemic fevers among them in the large towns. This affliction is no longer confined to themselves. In 1839, the Fever Board and the Directors of the Royal Infirmary of Edinburgh reported, that, "notwithstanding every exertion, fever has kept its ground in this city; and that on three different occasions within these twenty years, it has assumed the form of an appalling epidemic:—that its ravages have extended, while its malignity has greatly increased—the mortality having risen from one in twenty by near one in six; and it has passed from the dwellings of the poor to those of the rich, and prevailed extensively among families in easy and affluent circumstances:—that, within the last two years, it must have affected at least ten thousand of the population of the city." In 1838, one in thirty were affected. Here we see the rich falling victims to disease originating in their own neglect of the poor. A more striking illustration of the mode of operation of the natural laws, and of the certainty of the punishment which is inflicted for infringing them, could not have been presented.

hable that society does not know a tithe of its own resources for mitigating the evils which afflict it. The temperance societies are extremely useful in this respect. The substitution of comfortable food for intoxicating beverages, has the direct tendency to benefit the whole nervous system, and to increase the vigour of the higher powers of the mind. Society at large should bend its best energies, directed by sound knowledge, towards the accomplishment of this end.

Holding it, then, to be clearly both the duty and the interest of society to provide for the poor, the next question is, How should this be done: by legal assessment or by voluntary contributions? Phrenology enables us to answer this question also. The willingness of any individual to bestow charity, depends not exclusively on the quantity of wealth which he possesses, but likewise on the strength of the benevolent principles in relation to the selfish in his mind. Now, we discover by observation, that the organs of the benevolent and selfish feelings differ very widely in relative size in different individuals; and experience supports the conclusion which we draw from this fact;—that their dispositions to act charitably are as widely different. Not only so, but, as the leading principle of our present social system is the pursuit of self-interest, it may be stated as a general rule (allowance being always made for individual exceptions), that those in whom the selfish feelings, with intellect and prudence, predominate, will possess most wealth; and yet this very combination of faculties will render them least willing to bestow. Their wealth and benevolence will generally be in the inverse ratio of each other. This inference, unfortunately, is also supported by facts. It has frequently been remarked that the humbler classes of society, and also the poorer members of these classes, bestow more charity, in proportion to their incomes, than the very wealthy. To trust to voluntary contributions, therefore, would be to exempt thousands who are most able, but least willing, to bear the burden, and to double it on those who are most willing, but least able, to support it.*

The correctness of this observation is supported by the following extract from a Report by the Committee of Contributors to the Royal Infirmary of Edinburgh, presented to the general meeting held on 5th January 1845. "This state of matters has induced us to look with anxiety to the revenue, and more especially to that part of the fluctuating branch arising from the subscription contributions and church collections; and when we consider that the population of Edinburgh is 133,000, and the inhabited houses 22,500, and that the population of Leith is 26,000, and the inhabited houses 4600—making (exclusive of Portobello, Musselburgh, &c.) a total population of about 160,000, and 27,000 inhabited houses, it is surprising, and much to be lamented, that the subscription contributors above 5s. are under 1800 and that the contributions are under £3000.

* Professor Alison has arrived at the same conclusions by means of practical observation. He says, "In following out this inquiry (into the condition of the poor) I have long since formed, and do not scruple to express, an opinion, which I cannot expect to be in the first instance, either well received or generally credited in this country, viz., that the higher ranks in Scotland do much less (and what they do, less systematically, and therefore less effectually) for the relief of poverty and of sufferings resulting from it, than those of any other country in Europe which is really well regulated." And again, "many respectable citizens (of Edinburgh) never appear among the subscribers to any public charity, at the same time that they steadily withstand all solicitations for private alms, and thus reduce the practice of this Christian duty (charity) to the utmost possible simplicity."—*On the Management of the Poor in Scotland*, pp. 11 and 23.

When it is recollected that the object of the Institution is to provide a comfortable abode—the best medical skill—the purest medicines—and the most experienced nurses—to relieve the bodily sufferings of the poorer classes of society; and when we consider the deep interest which those in more fortunate circumstances have that the progress of disease should be arrested (independent of higher considerations), we cannot resist the conclusion that there must either be some misapprehension as to the Institution, or a callousness to charity which we are unwilling to impute."

I select these examples of local charity, because I believe them to be applicable to many cities besides Edinburgh, and they lead to the conclusion that while the present principles of social action prevail, compulsory assessment is indispensable; and I am inclined to carry it the length of assessing for the maintenance of the poor in all their forms. There are voluntary societies for supporting the destitute sick, a House of Refuge, the Deaf and Dumb Institution, the Blind Asylum, and the Royal Infirmary. I have been told that these, and all the other charitable institutions of Edinburgh, are sustained by about fifteen hundred benevolent individuals, many of whom subscribe to them all, and most of whom subscribe to several, while the remaining twenty or thirty thousand of the adult population of the city and suburbs, who are able to bear a part of the burden, never contribute a farthing to any one of these objects. In a sound social system this should not be the case. It is a social duty incumbent on us all to alleviate the calamities of our unfortunate, and even of our guilty brethren; and until our moral principles shall be so quickened as to induce us all to discharge this duty voluntarily, we should be compelled to do so by law.

On another point I am disposed to carry our social duties farther than is generally done. I regard the money applied to the maintenance of the indigent as, at present, to a great extent wasted, in consequence of no efficient measures being adopted by society, to check pauperism at its roots. If I am correct in ascribing it to a low temperament, imperfect development of brain, habits of intoxication, ignorance, and commercial fluctuations, efficient means must be used to remove these causes, before it can either cease, or be effectually diminished; and as the removal of them would, in the end, be the best policy, for both the public and the poor, I am humbly of opinion that the community, if they were alive to their own interests, as well as to their duty, would supply the pecuniary means for laying the axe to the root of the tree, and, by a rational education, and elevation of the physical and mental condition of the lower classes of society, would bring pauperism to a close, or, at all events, diminish its present gigantic and increasing dimensions.* Here the regret always occurs, that our senseless wars should have wasted so much capital that we must provide twenty-seven millions of pounds sterling annually to pay the interest of it; a sum which, but for these wars, might have been applied to the moral advancement of society, and have carried a thousand blessings in its train. If our moral sentiments were once rendered as active as our propensities have been, and I fear still are, we should devote our public assessments to beneficial social objects, render them liberal in proportion to the magnitude of the work to be accomplished, and pay them with a hearty good-will, because they would all return to ourselves in social blessings.

* It is gratifying to observe that the suggestion in the text has, to some extent, been recently carried into effect by the Poor-Law Commissioners of England. See their admirable report "on the Training of Pauper Children," 1841.

The question is frequently asked, How are these principles, even supposing them to be founded in nature, ever to be carried into execution, seeing that the opinions of society are strongly opposed to them. In answer, I appeal to the experience of the world. All new opinions are rejected, and their authors persecuted or ridiculed at first; but, in all instances in which they have been true, they have been ultimately adopted. Galileo was imprisoned for proclaiming the first principles of a scientific astronomy. Fifty years elapsed before his opinions made any perceptible progress; but now they are taught in schools and colleges; and the mariner guides his ship by them on the ocean. It was the same in regard to the circulation of the blood; and it will be the same in regard to the application of the new philosophy to the social improvement of man. The present generation will descend, condemning it, to their graves; but, if it be true, we are sowing in young minds seeds that will grow, flourish, and ripen into an abundant harvest of practical fruits in due season. A thousand years are with the Lord as one day, and with society a hundred years are as one day in the life of an individual. Let us sedulously sow the seed, therefore, trusting that, if sound and good, it will not perish by the way-side, but bring forth fruits of kindness, peace, and love, in the appointed season.*

I forbear suggesting any particular plan by which the objects now detailed may be accomplished; because no plan can become practical until the public mind be instructed in the principles, and convinced of the truth of the doctrines, which I am now teaching; and whenever they shall be so convinced, they will devise plans for themselves with infinitely greater facility and success than we can pretend to do, who live only in the dawn of the brighter day.

The next social duty to which I advert, relates to the treatment of criminals, or of those individuals who commit offences against the persons or property of the members of the community. The present practice is to leave every man to the freedom of his own will, until he shall have committed an offence; in other words, until he shall have seriously injured his neighbour; and then to employ, at the public expense, officers of justice to detect him, witnesses to prove his crime, a jury to convict him, judges to condemn him, jailors to imprison, or executioners to put him to death, according as the law shall have decreed. It will be observed, that in all this proceeding there is no inquiry into the causes which led to the crime, into the remedies for crime, or into the effects of the treatment on the offender, or on society; yet every one of these points should be clearly ascertained before we can judge correctly of our social duties in regard to the treatment of criminals.

As to the cause of crime, there is a strange inconsistency between our theological and legal standards on the proclivity of the human mind to evil. The articles of our church teach us that the human heart is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked; while, legally, every man is regarded as so completely a moral agent, that he can command his will and his actions; and hence, that, when a clear law which his intellect can comprehend, is laid down for his guidance, he is a just and proper subject for punishment, if he infringe it. The premises and the conclusion in this last view are consistent with each other, and if this

were a correct description of human nature, there would be no gainsaying the propriety of the practice. We should still, however, find a difficulty in accounting for our want of success in putting an end to crime; for, if these principles of criminal legislation and punitive infliction be sound, it appears a strange anomaly that crime has everywhere, and in every age, abounded most where punishment, especially severe punishment, has been most extensively administered, and that it has abated in all countries where penal infliction has become mild and merciful. There is, however, an error in this view of human nature, which Phrenology enables us to detect.

It appears incredible, that, in a well-governed country like this, where detection and punishment are almost certain to follow crime, any man should infringe the law, if he were not urged by impulses which obtained the mastery, for the time, over conscience and reason. We need not waste time, however, in speculating on this subject, but may come at once to facts.

As mentioned in a former lecture, the brain may be divided into three great regions; those of the Animal Propensities, Moral Sentiments, and Intellectual Faculties.

In some individuals, the organs of the propensities bear the ascendancy, in point of size, over those of the moral and intellectual faculties. Such men feel the impulses of passion very strongly, and are internally urged by vigorous selfish desires, which vehemently crave for gratification; while, on the other hand, they possess only feeble glimpses of moral obligation, and a glimmering of intellectual perception. When beings thus constituted are placed in a dense society, in which every man is struggling to acquire property and to advance his own fortunes, they commence the same career; but they take the road that first presents itself to their own peculiar minds;—they are impatient to obtain gratification of their passions; they feel few restraints from conscience or religion, as to the mode of doing so; they are greatly deficient in intellectual capacity, in patience, perseverance, and acquired skill; and from all these causes, they rush to crime, as the directest method of enjoying pleasure.

The class of minds which forms the greatest contrast to this one, is that in which the moral and intellectual organs decidedly predominate over those of the animal propensities. Individuals thus constituted have naturally strong feelings of moral and religious obligation, and vigorous intellectual perceptions, while the solicitations of their animal passions are relatively moderate.

The third class is intermediate between these two. They have the organs of the propensities, of the moral sentiments, and of the intellectual faculties, nearly in a state of equilibrium. They have strong passions, but they have also strong powers of moral and religious emotion, and of intellectual perception.

Fortunately, the lowest class of minds is not numerous. The highest class appears to me to abound extensively; while the middle class is also numerous. The middle and the highest class are at least as twenty to one, in comparison with the lowest.

I am aware that many of my present audience, who have not attended to Phrenology, may regard these, not as facts, but as dangerous fancies and groundless speculations. To such persons I can only say, that if they will take the same means that Phrenologists have taken to discover whether these are truths in nature or not, they will find it as impossible to doubt of their reality, as of the existence of the sun at noon-day; and there is no rule of philosophy by which facts should be disregarded, merely because they are unknown to those who have never taken the trouble to observe them. I respectfully

* The serious efforts now making by the Sanatory Commissioners to improve the health of large towns; by the prison boards to improve the treatment of criminals; by magistrates and public officers to provide houses of refuge and reclamation for young offenders; and by Captain Macnochie to induce the Government to improve convict management,—all afford the most satisfactory evidence of the progress of sound principles towards practical results within the last ten years. 1846.

solicit you to consider that the brain is not of human creation, but the workmanship of God, and that it is a most pernicious error to regard its functions and its influence on the mental dispositions with indifference. I beg leave here to assume that the views now presented are founded in nature, and to apply them in elucidation of our social duties in the treatment of criminals.

In the case of persons possessing the lowest class of brains, we are presented with beings whose tendencies to crime are naturally very strong, and whose powers of moral guidance and restraint are very feeble. We permit such individuals to move at large, in a state of society in which intoxicating liquors, calculated to excite and gratify their animal propensities, are abundant, and easily obtained, and in which property, the great means of procuring pleasure, is everywhere exposed to their appropriation; we proclaim the law, that if they invade this property, or if, in the ecstasies of their drunken excitement, they commit violence on each other, or on the other members of the community, they shall be imprisoned, banished, or hanged, according to the degree of their offence; and in that condition of things, we leave them to the free action of their own faculties and the influence of external circumstances.

It appears a self-evident proposition, that if such men are actuated by strong animal passions (a proposition which few will dispute), there must be an antagonist power, of some kind or other, to restrain and guide them, before they can be led to virtue or withheld from vice. Now, the well-constituted members of society, judging from their own minds, assume that these individuals possess moral feelings and intellectual capacities adequate to this object, if they choose to apply them. On the other hand, the conviction forced on me by observation, not only of the brain, but of the lives and histories of great and habitual criminals, is, that they do not enjoy these controlling powers in an adequate degree to enable them successfully to resist the temptations presented by their passions and external circumstances. In treating of the foundations of moral obligation, I mentioned that I had repentedly gone to jails, and requested the jailers to write down the character and crimes of the most distinguished inmates of the prisons; that before seeing these descriptions, I had examined their heads and also noted in writing the dispositions and probable crimes which I inferred from the development of their brains, and that the two had coincided. This could not have happened unless, in such cases, the brain had a real influence in determining the actions of the individuals. Especially, wherever the moral and the intellectual organs were very deficient, and the organs of the propensities were large, I found the whole life to have been devoted to crime and to nothing else. I saw a criminal of this description, who had been sent to the lunatic asylum in Dublin, in consequence of the belief that a life of such undeviating wickedness as he had led, could result only from insanity; for he had repeatedly undergone every species of punishment, civil and military, short of death, and had also been sentenced to death—all without effect. Yet the physician assured me that he was not insane, in the usual acceptation of the term; that all his mental organs and perceptions, so far as he possessed them, were sound, but that he had scarcely any natural capacity of feeling or comprehending the dictates of moral obligation, while he was subject to the most energetic action of the animal propensities, whenever an external cause of excitement presented itself. In him the brain, in the region of the propensities, was enormously large, and very deficient in the region of the moral sentiments. The physician, Dr Crawford, remarked, that he considered him most properly treated when he

was handed over to the lunatic asylum, because, although his brain was not diseased, the extreme deficiency in the moral organs rendered him morally blind, just as the want of eyes would render a man incapable of seeing.

In October 1835, I saw another example of the same kind in the jail of Newcastle, in the person of an old man of 73, who was then under sentence of transportation for theft, and whose whole life had been spent in crime. He had been twice transported, and at the age of 73 was still in the hands of justice, to suffer for his offences against the law.* These are facts, and being facts, it is God who has ordained them. Phrenologists are no more answerable for them, or their consequences, than the anatomist is answerable for blindness, when he demonstrates that the cause of that malady is a defect in the structure of the eye. Blame appears to me to lie with those persons who, under an infatuation of prejudice, refuse to examine into these most important facts when they are offered to their consideration, and who resolutely decline to give effect to them in the treatment of criminals.

The question now presents itself, What mode of treatment does this view of the natural dispositions of criminals suggest? Every one is capable of understanding that if the optic nerve be too feeble to allow of perfect vision, or the auditory nerve too small to permit complete hearing, the persons thus afflicted should not be placed in situations in which perfect vision and hearing are necessary to enable them to avoid doing evil; nay, it will also be granted without much difficulty, that deficiency in the organ of Tune may be the cause why some individuals have no perception of melody; and it will be admitted, that, on this account, it would be cruel to prescribe to them the task of learning to play even a simple air, under pain of being severely punished if they failed. But most people immediately demur when we assure them that some human beings exist, who, in consequence of deficiency in the moral organs, are as blind to the dictates of benevolence and justice, as the others are deaf to melody; and that it is equally cruel to prescribe to them, as the law does, the practice of moral duties, and then to punish them severely because they fail. Yet the conclusion that this treatment is cruel is inevitable, if the premises be sound.

What, then, should be done with this class of beings? for I am speaking only of a class, small in comparison with the great mass of society. The established mode of treating them by inflicting punishment has not been successful. Those who object to the new views, constantly forget that the old method has been an eminent failure,—that is to say, that crime has gone on increasing in amount, in proportion as punishment has been abundantly administered; and they shut their eyes to the conclusion which experience has established, that be the causes of crime what they may, punishment has not yet been successful in removing them, and that therefore it cannot, on any grounds of reason, be maintained to be of itself sufficient for this purpose. The new philosophy dictates that the idea of punishment, considered as mere retribution, should be discarded. Punishment, in this sense, really means vengeance;

* In October 1839, I visited the state prison of Connecticut, at Weathersfield, near Hartford, in presence of the Rev. Mr. Gallaudet, Principal Totten, and other gentlemen, and saw a man in whose head the moral organs were very deficient, and the animal organs large. Mr. Pillsbury, the superintendent of the prison, stated that this man had passed thirty years of his life in the state prison, under four several sentences, and that he had no doubt, that, if then liberated, he would, in a week, be again engaged in crime. See note, p. 42.

and the desire for inflicting it arises from an erroneous conception of the structure and condition of the criminal mind, and from the activity of our own passions, which are excited by the injuries inflicted on us by the actions and outrages of this class of persons. Our duty is to withdraw external temptation, and to supply, by physical restraint, that deficiency of moral control which is the great imperfection of their minds. We should treat them as moral patients. They should be placed in penitentiaries, and prevented from abusing their faculties, yet be humanely treated, and permitted to enjoy comfort and as much liberty as they could sustain, without injuring themselves or their fellow-men. They should be taught morality, knowledge, and religion, so far as their faculties enable them to learn; and they should be trained to industry.

This mode of treatment would render their lives happier than they could ever be were their persons left at large in society; and it would make them also useful. I consider the restoration of this class of persons to the possession of a moral self-control as nearly hopeless: they resemble those who are blind and deaf from irremediable defects in the organs of sight and hearing. If, however, by long restraint and moral training and instruction, they should ever become capable of self-guidance, they should be viewed as patients who have recovered, and be liberated, on the understanding that if they should relapse into immoral habits, they should be restored to their places in the asylum.*

It has been frequently urged that this doctrine abolishes responsibility; but I am at a loss to comprehend the exact import of this objection. As formerly mentioned, the distinction between right and wrong does not depend on the freedom of the human will, as many persons suppose, but on the constitution of our faculties. Every action is morally right which gratifies all our faculties, enlightened and acting harmoniously; and every action is wrong which outrages or offends them. Hence, if we see a furious madman or a mischievous idiot (whom no one supposes to be free agents), burning a house or murdering a child, we are compelled, by our whole moral faculties, to condemn such actions as wrong, and to arrest the perpetrator of them in his wild career. Now, the case of the class of offenders which we have been discussing, is precisely analogous. Like the madman, they are under the influence of uncontrollable passions, existing, in their case, in consequence of the natural predominance of certain organs in the brain, and in his, from ascendancy of the passions produced by cerebral disease. Society absolves idiots and the insane from punishment, and we only plead that this class of unfortunate beings should be as extensive in the eye of the law as it is in nature; and that by erroneous legal definitions of insanity, and by legal fictions, the really insane should not be treated as criminals. The actions of the morally insane, whom we wish to include in it, are without hesitation condemned; and no one doubts that we should put a stop to their outrages, although we do not regard the individuals as guilty. The important question, therefore, is, By what means may society be most effectually protected against their injurious assaults on property and life? The disciples of the old school answer, that this may be best done by holding them responsible for their actions, and punishing them; but in doing so, they turn a deaf ear to the lessons

of experience, which proclaim only the failure of this treatment in times past: They close their understandings against the examination of new facts, which promise to account for that failure; they assume, in opposition to both philosophy and experience, that these men can act rightly if they choose, and that they can choose so to act; and finally, in consequence of these prejudices, errors, and false assumptions, and without considerations for the real welfare either of society or of the offenders, they indulge their own animal resentment, by delivering over the victims of cerebral malformation or disease to jailors and executioners, to be punished for committing actions which their defective mental constitution rendered it impossible for them to avoid. There is no wonder that crime does not diminish under such a form of treatment.

The disciples of the new philosophy, on the other hand, answer the question by appealing to experience; by looking at facts; by consulting reason; by regarding the advantage at once of the criminal and of society: they say that physical and moral restraint are the only effectual remedies for this great evil; that these should be unhesitatingly applied—not vindictively, but in affection and humanity; and that then the offences of this class of criminals will be diminished in number.*

There remain two other classes of minds to be considered in relation to criminal legislation—those whose organs of propensity, moral sentiment, and intellect, are pretty equally balanced, and those in whom the moral and intellectual faculties predominate; but the consideration of these must be reserved till the next Lecture.

LECTURE XIII.

TREATMENT OF CRIMINALS CONTINUED.

Criminals in whom the moral and intellectual organs are considerably developed—Influence of external circumstances on this class—Doctrine of regeneration—Importance of attending to the functions of the brain in reference to this subject, and the treatment of criminals—Power of society over the conduct of men possessing brains of the middle class—Case of a criminal made so by circumstances—Expediency of keeping certain men from temptation—Thefts by post-office officials—Aid furnished by Phrenology, in selecting persons to fill confidential situations—Punishment of criminals—Objects of Punishment—Its legitimate ends are to protect society by example, and to reform the offenders—Means of effecting these purposes—Confinement—Employment—Unsatisfactory state of our existing prisons—Moral improvement of criminals.

The second class of heads to which I direct your attention, is that in which the organs of the animal propensities, of the moral sentiments, and of the intellectual faculties, are all large, and nearly in equilibrium. In individuals, thus constituted, the large organs of the propensities give rise to vivid manifes-

* Since the first edition of this work was published, Mr M. B. Sampson has treated the whole subject referred to in the text in a masterly manner, in Letters on "Criminal Jurisprudence considered in relation to Mental Organisation." They have been published in a cheap form, and I strongly recommend them to the attention of the reader.

The views presented in the text are now operating on the minds of the middle classes of society, although still opposed by the learned. Lawyers in general reject them, but juries give effect to them in their verdicts. I lately heard a bishop and a lawyer lamenting over the degeneracy of modern times, evinced by the impossibility of inducing juries to convict for death, where the plea of insanity was urged as a defence! 1846.

* I have conversed on the subject of the irreclaimable dispositions of this class of criminals, with intelligent and humane superintendents of prisons in Britain and the United States of America, and they have expressed a decided conviction that there are prisoners whom no punishment will recall to virtue, but who, when liberated, constantly recommence their career of crime.

tations of the animal feelings, but the large organs of the moral sentiments and intellect produce also strong moral emotions and intellectual perceptions. In practical conduct such persons are, to a remarkable extent, the creatures of external circumstances. If one of them, born of profligate parents, be trained to idleness, intoxication, and crime, his whole lower organs will thus, from infancy, be called into vivid action, while his moral sentiments will receive no proportionate cultivation. His intellectual faculties, denied all rational and useful instruction, will be employed only in serving and assisting the propensities; they will be sharpened to perpetrate crime, and to elude punishment. Such an individual will be prepared to become an habitual criminal, and he will be the more dangerous to society on account of the considerable degree in which he possesses moral and intellectual faculties. These will give him an extent of intelligence and plausibility, which will enable him only the more successfully to deceive, or probably to obtain access to places of trust, in which he may commit the more extensive peculations.

If, on the other hand, an individual thus constituted be placed from infancy in the bosom of a moral, intelligent, and religious family, who shall present few or no temptations to his propensities, but many powerful and agreeable excitements to his higher faculties; if he shall have passed the period of youth under this influence, and in early manhood have been ushered into society with all the advantages of a respectable profession, and a high character, and been received and cherished by the virtuous as one of themselves; then his moral and intellectual faculties may assume and maintain the ascendancy during life.

If, again, an individual of this class have been religiously educated, but, in early youth, have left home, and been much thrown upon the world;—that is to say, left to associate with persons of indifferent characters and dispositions, he may gradually deteriorate. In the dawn of manhood and blaze of his passions, his conduct may be not a little profligate and disreputable: But as he advances in life, the energy of the animal organs may begin to decay; or they may be exhausted by excessive indulgence; or he may suffer afflictions in his health, in his family, or in his worldly circumstances (all which have a tendency, for the time, to quell the energy of the animal passions); and under the influence of these combined causes and circumstances, his moral organs may recover their activity, his early religious impressions may resume their ascendancy, and he may come forth a repentant sinner, and a reformed man.

In religion, this process is generally called regeneration. According to my observation, the men who are converted and reformed from habitual profligacy, and who continue, afterwards, permanently moral and religious characters, possess this combination of brain. They become profligate at first, from the energetic action of their large organs of the animal propensities; and when subsequently they become respectable Christians, they act under the control of their moral and intellectual powers.

I am aware, that, in making this statement, I am treading on delicate ground; because many sincere and excellent persons believe that these results flow from the influence of the Holy Spirit, and that the Holy Spirit operates in regenerating sinners altogether independently of the laws of organization; in short, that the influence is supernatural. I do not at all dispute the power of God to operate independently of the natural laws: the very idea of his being omnipotent, implies power to do according to his pleasure, in all circumstances and times; but it appears to me that, the age of miracles being past, it does not now please God to operate on the human

mind either independently of, or in contradiction to, the laws of organization instituted by himself. This reduces the question, not to one respecting God's power, for we all grant this to be boundless, but to one of fact,—whether it pleases Him actually to manifest his power over the human mind, *always* in harmony with,—or sometimes independently of,—and at other times in contradiction to, the laws of organization; and this fact, like any other, must be determined by experience and observation. I humbly report the results of my own observations; and say that, although I have seen a number of men of renewed lives, I have never met with one possessing a brain of the lowest character, who continued moral amidst the ordinary temptations of the world. Such men occasionally appear moral for a time; but they do not remain steadfast in the paths of virtue when temptation is presented. On the contrary, I have uniformly seen regenerated men who maintained their position, possess a brain in which the organs of the animal propensities, the moral sentiments, and the intellect, were *all* considerably developed; so that in these instances, the influence of religion seemed to me to operate completely in *harmony* with the organic laws. That influence cast the balance in favour of the higher sentiments, gave them the permanent ascendancy, and hence produced the regenerated character.

These observations can be met, not by argument, but by counter facts. If any one will show me cases in which men possessing the defective brains of idiots, or the diseased brains of insanity, have, by any religious influences, been converted into rational and pious Christians, he will completely overthrow my conclusions; because such facts would shew unequivocally that it does please God, in some instances, to operate on the mind, even in our day, independently of, or in contradiction to, the laws of organization. Nay, if examples shall be produced of men possessing the worst brains, becoming permanently, by the influence of religion, excellent practical Christians amidst external temptations, I shall yield the point. But no such examples have yet been exhibited. On the contrary, we see individuals whose heads are less than thirteen inches in circumference at the level of the eyebrows and occipital spine, continue irretrievable idiots through life; and we see madmen continue insane until their brains are restored to health by natural means. Nay, farther, I was told by the late Rev. Dr Andrew Thomson, who attended Mary Mackinnon, the mistress of a brothel, while under sentence of death for murder, that he found it impossible, on account of her great natural incapacity, to convey to her any precise views or feelings of religion, or of the heinousness of her crime, and that he was greatly grieved to observe that nearly all he said fell powerless on her mind; or if it did rouse any feeling, this lasted only for a moment. If you examine the development of her head, as shewn in the cast, you will find that the moral and intellectual organs are very deficient. In regard to moral, intellectual, and religious impressions, she was in a condition similar to that in which a person with an extremely small organ of Tune would find himself in relation to music. Either he could not perceive the melody at all; or, if he did, the impression would die instantly when the instrument ceased to sound in his ears.

Perhaps some of you may be of opinion that this is a discussion which belongs more to theology than to moral philosophy. In reply, I remark, that the question regarding what is the *scriptural doctrine* touching regeneration belongs to theology, and I avoid all discussion of it; but the question, does any religious influence act independently of, or in contradiction to, the laws of organization, is one which belongs to

philosophy. Indeed, it teaches a fundamental point in moral philosophy; because, if the laws of nature, on which alone philosophy rests, are liable, in the case of mind, to be traversed by influences of any kind operating independently of, or in contradiction to them, *moral philosophy can have no foundation*. There may be a theology comprising a code of moral duty, founded on Scripture; but assuredly there can be no philosophy of morals founded on nature. In like manner, there can be no natural religion; because all our scientific observations and conclusions will be constantly liable to be falsified, and rendered worse than useless, by a supernatural influence producing results entirely independent of, or in contradiction to, the causes which are presented in nature for the guidance of our understandings. This question, therefore, is not only important, but, as I have said, fundamental in a course of moral philosophy; and I could not consistently avoid introducing it. Many theologians deny that any sound philosophy of morals can be drawn from the study of nature; and found morals, as well as religion, exclusively on revelation. This opinion leads them to shut their eyes to many most important facts in nature, and to depreciate their value. It appears to me that they err in this conclusion; and that theology will be improved, when divines become acquainted with the constitution of the human faculties, their dependence on organization, and the natural laws of man in general.

I beg you to observe, that this question here assumes a different aspect from that in which it is generally presented to your consideration. In the discussions which commonly take place on it, we find arguments and opinions stated against arguments and opinions; and the result is mere unprofitable disputation. In the present case, I adduce facts,—in other words, God's will written in his works; and these are placed, not against the Bible (for, be it observed, there is no declaration in Scripture that any religious influences operate independently of, or in contradiction to, the natural laws), but against human inferences unwarrantably (as it appears to me) drawn from Scripture, that this is the case. We place facts in nature against human interpretations of Scripture; and these too, deduced at first, and now insisted on, by men who were, and are, entirely ignorant of the facts in question.

A second reason for introducing this subject is, that I consider it to be of great importance that religious persons should be correctly informed concerning the facts. If you examine the lists of the members of the most useful and benevolent societies in all parts of the country, and especially of prison-discipline societies, you will discover that individuals distinguished for their religious character form a large and a highly influential portion of them. These persons act boldly and conscientiously on their own principles; and if, in any respect, their views happen to be erroneous, they become, by their very sincerity, union, and devotion, the most formidable enemies to improvement. In consequence of profound ignorance of the facts in nature which I have stated, this class of persons, or at least many of them are alarmed at the doctrine of the influence of the brain on the mental dispositions, and oppose the practical application of it in criminal legislation, in prison-discipline, and in schools; and they obstinately refuse to inquire into the facts, because they imagine that they have the warrant of Scripture for maintaining that they *cannot be true*. This conduct is unphilosophical, and sheds no lustre on religion. It impedes the progress of truth, and retards the practical application of the natural laws to the removal of one of the greatest evils with which society is afflicted. This is no gratuitous supposition on my part; because I know, from the best authority, that

within these few weeks, when the Prison-discipline Society of this city was formed, religious men specially objected to the admission of an individual into that society, because he was known to be a phrenologist, and to hold the opinions which I am here expounding; in other words, an individual who had studied and observed the natural laws in regard to the influence of the brain on the mental dispositions, was deliberately excluded from that society, lest he should attempt to point out to its members the advantages to be derived from knowing and obeying the laws of God!*

Thirdly, I introduce this subject because, from the extensive observations which have been made by Dr Gall, Dr Spurzheim, and their followers, during the last five-and-thirty years in many parts of the world, I have the most complete conviction that the facts which I now state are true, and that they will inevitably prevail; and that, whenever they do prevail, the enemies of religion will be furnished with a new weapon with which to assail her, by the opposition which religious persons are now making to improvements in the treatment of criminals, in ignorance, as I have said, of these facts, and of their inevitable consequences. They will point to that opposition, and proclaim, as they have often done, that Religion sets herself forward as the enemy of all philosophy, and of every moral and social improvement which does not emanate from her own professors. Such an accusation will be unfounded when directed against religion; because it will be applicable only to religious men who are, at the same time, ill-informed and dogmatical. But only the enlightened and the candid will give effect to this distinction; and it therefore becomes every sincere friend to the best and holiest of causes, not to give occasion to the scoffer to point the finger of contempt at its resisting truth.

To return to the subject from which we have digressed, I observe, that in the case of this class of brains, in which the organs of the propensities, moral sentiments, and intellectual faculties, are nearly in equilibrium, society enjoys a great power in producing good or evil. If, by neglecting education, by encouraging the use of intoxicating liquors, by permitting commercial convulsions attended with extreme destitution, society allows individuals possessing this combination of mental organs to be thrown back, as it were, on their animal propensities, it may expect to rear a continual succession of criminals. If, by a thorough and all-pervading training and education, moral, religious, and intellectual; by well regulated social institutions providing steady employment, with adequate remuneration; and also by affording opportunities for innocent recreation, this class of men shall be led to seek their chief enjoyments from their moral and intellectual faculties, and to restrain their animal propensities, they may be effectually saved from vice. It is from this class that the great body of criminals arises; and as their conduct is determined, to a great extent, by their external circumstances, the only means of preventing them from becoming criminals, is, to fortify their higher faculties by training and education, and to remove external temptation by introducing improvements, as far as possible, into our social habits and institutions.

There are instances of individuals committing

* I could name important Institutions, supported by public subscriptions, which have been brought to an admirable state of efficiency by aid of the lights which Phrenology sheds on the human mind in health and in disease; but which aid is carefully concealed from the public, although candidly acknowledged in private, lest, were the fact avowed, the evangelical subscribers should withdraw their contributions! 1846.

crime, who do not belong precisely to any of the classes which I have described, but who have, perhaps, one organ, such as Acquisitiveness, in great excess, or another, such as Conscientiousness, extremely deficient. These individuals occasionally commit crime, under strong temptation, although their dispositions, in general, are good. I knew an individual who had a good intellect, with much Benevolence, Veneration, and Love of Approbation, but in whom a large organ of Secretiveness was combined with a great deficiency of Conscientiousness. His life had been respectable for many years, in the situation of a clerk, while his duty was merely to write books, and conduct correspondence; but when he was promoted, and entrusted with buying and selling, and paying and receiving cash, his moral principles gave way. The temptation to which he yielded was not a selfish one. He was much devoted to religion, and began by lending his master's money, for a few days, to his religious friends, who did not always repay it; he next proceeded to assist the poorer brethren; he also opened his house in great hospitality to the members of the congregation to which he belonged: These actions gratified at once his Benevolence and Love of Approbation, and rendered him extremely popular in his own circle; but the expenses which they entailed speedily placed his master's cash so extensively in arrear, that he had no hope of recovering the deficiency by any ordinary means. He then purchased lottery tickets to a large amount, hoping for a good prize to restore him to honour and independence. These prizes never came, and the result was, disclosure, disgrace, and misery.

The way to prevent crime, in cases like this, is to avoid presenting temptation to men whose defective moral organs do not enable them to withstand it. Phrenology will certainly come to the assistance of society in this respect, because it affords the means of determining beforehand, whether any great moral deficiency exists. The chief officers of the post-office in Britain frequently have persons pressed on them to act in subordinate stations, who are recommended not by their own fitness but by influential political patrons; and the consequence is, that scarcely a day closes in which one or more capital felonies have not been committed, in abstracting money from letters. I called the attention of Sir Edward Lees, late secretary of the Edinburgh post-office, to the aid which Phrenology might afford towards the remedy of this evil, by enabling the Government to select individuals in whom the moral and intellectual organs so decidedly predominate over those of the animal propensities, that they would be free from internal temptations to steal, and of course be more able to resist the external temptations presented by their situations. He visited the Museum of the Phrenological Society, where I shewed him the skulls and busts of many executed criminals, from Europe, Asia, Africa, and America, and enabled him to compare them with the skulls and busts of virtuous men: he acknowledged that the difference was so palpable that it was impossible to avoid the perception of it, and that he could not see any sufficient reason why Phrenology, if borne out by large experience, should not be applied in this manner; but added, truly, that, being only a subordinate functionary, he had no power to carry so great an innovation into practice.*

* If the Post-Office and other public authorities would order accurate casts to be made from the heads of all their servants who are convicted of embezzlement, and compare them with the heads of those who have maintained the highest character for tried integrity, they would see a difference that would force them to believe in the influence of organisation on the mental dispositions; but while the pa-

The reason why I introduce these facts is, to press on your attention the dereliction of social duty which the better constituted members of society commit, while they neglect to use the light which Providence presents to their eyes. If official persons place men in whom the animal faculties predominate, or in whom the balance between them and the moral powers only hangs in equilibrium, in external circumstances in which temptations are presented to the inferior faculties stronger than they are able to resist, a great portion of the guilt of their offences lies with those who thus expose them to trial; and although the criminal law does not recognise this as guilt, the natural law clearly does so. Loss, annoyance, and sometimes ruin, ensue from these depredations; and if the municipal law held those responsible for the evils who appointed the delinquents to office, the natural chastisements for placing improper persons in situations of trust would reach the primary offenders.

It may appear hard, that these punishments should have been inflicted for so many generations, while men did not possess any adequate means of discriminating natural dispositions, so as to be able to avoid them. This difficulty presents itself in regard to all the natural laws; and the only answer that can be offered is, that it has pleased Providence to constitute man a progressive being, and to subject him to a rigid discipline in his progress to knowledge. Our ancestors suffered and died under the ravages of the smallpox, until they discovered vaccination; and we lately suffered helplessly under cholera, because we have not yet found out its causes and remedies. There are merchants who employ Phrenology in the selection of clerks, warehousemen, and other individuals in whom confidence must be placed, and they have reaped the advantages of its lights.

I may here remark, that the number of really inferior brains is not great; and that of all the countless thousands who are entrusted with property, and have the power of appropriating or misapplying it, the number who actually do so is comparatively small. Still, those who do not know how to judge of dispositions from the brain, are left under an habitual uncertainty whether any particular individual, on whose fidelity their fortunes depend, and whom they had always regarded as an example of the highest class, may be found, on some unlucky day, to belong to the inferior order.

I repeat, then, that the first step towards preventing, and thereby diminishing, crimes, is to avoid placing men with inferior brains in external circumstances of temptation, which they are not calculated to resist. The second is, to give every possible vigour to the moral and intellectual faculties, by so exercising and instructing them, as to cast the balance of power and activity in their favour. And the third is, to improve, as sedulously as possible, our social institutions, so as to encourage the activity of the higher powers, and diminish that of the inferior faculties, in all the members of society.

The next question to be considered is, How should men, having brains of this middle class, be treated, after they have yielded to temptation, infringed the law, and been convicted of crime? The established method is, to confine them before trial in crowded prisons, in utter idleness, and in the society of criminals like themselves; and after trial and condemnation, to continue them in the same society, with the addition of labour; to transport them to New South Wales, or to hang them. In no aspect of European and Christian society, are there more striking marks of

tronaage of Government is wielded chiefly as a means of rewarding political subservency, the public interests must give way to those of party politicians.

a still lingering barbarism, than in the treatment of criminals. In almost no other institutions of society are there more glaring indications of an utter want of the philosophy of mind, than in the prisons of Britain.* But let us descend to particulars.

We have seen that men of the middle class of cerebral development (and most criminals belong to it) are led into crime in consequence of the ascendancy, for the time, of their animal propensities; but that, nevertheless, they possess, to a considerable extent, also moral sentiments and intellect. In treating them as criminals, we may have various objects in view. First, our object may be revenge, or the desire to inflict suffering on them because they have made society suffer. This is the feeling of savages, and of all rude and naturally cruel minds: and if we avow this as our principle of action, and carry it consistently into effect, we should employ instruments of torture, and put our criminals to a cruel and lingering death. But the national mind is humanized beyond the toleration of this practice. I humbly think, however, that as we profess to be humane, we should entirely discard the principle of vengeance from our treatment, as unchristian, unphilosophical, and inexpedient, and not allow it to mingle even covertly, as I fear it still does, with our system of criminal legislation.

Or, secondly, our object may be, by inflicting suffering on criminals, to deter other men from offending. This is the general and popular notion of the great end of punishment; and when applied to men of the middle class of faculties, it is not without foundation. Individuals who are strongly solicited by their animal propensities, and have a very great deficiency of the moral and intellectual faculties,—that is to say, criminals of the lowest grade of brain,—are not alive even to the fear of punishment. You will find them committing capital felonies, while they are attending the execution of their previous associates for similar offences. Their moral and intellectual organs are so deficient, that they possess no adequate controlling power over their propensities to enable them to profit by example. The terror of punishment, therefore, scarcely produces an appreciable effect on their conduct; and some persons, drawing their observations from this class alone, have concluded, as a general rule, that suffering inflicted on one offender does not deter any other individual from committing crime. But I respectfully differ from this opinion. Wherever the organs of the moral and reflecting faculties possess considerable development, example does produce some effect: and the higher the moral and intellectual faculties rise in power, the more completely efficacious does it become. What one of us would not feel it as an enormous evil, to be dragged to prison; to be locked up, night and day, in the society of the basest of mankind; to be publicly tried at the bar of a criminal court, and subsequently transported as a felon to a distant colony? Most of us instinctively feel that death itself, in an honourable form, would be perfect bliss, compared with such a fate. If, therefore, any of us ever felt, for a moment, tempted to infringe the criminal law, unquestionably the contemplation of such appalling consequences of guilt would operate, to a considerable extent, in steadying our steps in virtue. But the error is very great, of supposing

that all men are constituted with such nice moral sensibilities as these. Superior minds feel in this manner, solely because their moral and intellectual organs are large; and the same feelings do not operate to the same extent in the case of men possessing inferior brains.

Laws have been enacted, in general, by men possessing the best class of brains, and they have erroneously imagined that punishment would have the same effect on all other individuals which it would have on themselves. While, therefore, I consider it certain that the fear of punishment *does operate* beneficially on the waverers, I regard its influence as much more limited than is generally believed. A man who has a tendency to commit crime, will be capable of anticipating the consequences of offending, with a degree of precision corresponding to the extent of his intellectual endowments; but in the same proportion will his capacity for eluding them, by superior address, increase; whence there is a counteracting influence, even in the possession of intellect. The faculty chiefly addressed by the prospect of punishment, is Fear, or Cautiousness; and although, in some men, this is a powerful sentiment, yet, in many, the organ is deficient, and there is little consciousness of the feeling.

On the whole, therefore, the conclusion at which I arrive on this point is, that the condition of convicted criminals should be such as should be felt to be a very serious abridgment of the enjoyments of moral and industrious men; and this it must necessarily be, even under the most improved method of treating them; but I do not consider it advisable that one pang of suffering should be added to their lot for the sake of deterring others, if that pang be not calculated to prove beneficial to themselves. Indeed, it is a questionable point in morals, whether society is at all warranted in inflicting on one of its members suffering which can do him no good, solely with a view to benefit itself by deterring others, at his expense, from committing crime. It appears to me that this is unjust, and, therefore, inadmissible; and it is still less defensible, because it is unnecessary.

Thirdly, our object in criminal legislation may be, at once to protect society by example, and to reform the offenders themselves. This appears to me to be the only real and legitimate object of criminal law in a Christian country, and the question arises, How may it best be accomplished?

A condemned criminal is necessarily an individual who has been convicted of abusing his animal propensities, and thereby inflicting evil on society. He has proved by his conduct, that his moral and intellectual powers do not possess sufficient energy, in all circumstances, to restrain his propensities. Restraint, therefore, must be supplied by external means; in other words, he must, both for his own sake and for that of society, be taken possession of, and prevented from doing mischief; he must be confined. Now, this first step of discipline itself affords a strong inducement to waverers to avoid crime; because, to the idle and dissolute, the lovers of ease and pleasure, confinement is a sore evil; one which they dread more than a severe but shorter infliction of pain. This measure is recommended, therefore, by three important considerations,—that it serves to protect society, to reform the criminal, and to deter other men from offending.

The next question is, How should the criminal be treated under confinement? The moment we understand his mental constitution and condition, the answer becomes obvious. Our object is to abate the activity of his animal propensities, and to increase the energy of his moral and intellectual faculties. The first step in allaying the activity of the propensities, is to withdraw every object and communica-

* The text was written in 1835-6, and an improvement has since taken place in the management of British prisons. A prison act has been passed, appointing Boards for the direction of prisons in Scotland, and Mr Frederick Hill, a gentleman distinguished for humanity and intelligence, has been named Inspector of them. 1841.

The improvement of prisons in both sections of the Island steadily proceeds; but still the true philosophy of prison discipline is little understood. 1846.

tion that tend to excite them. The most powerfully exciting causes to crime are idleness, intoxication, and the society of immoral associates. In our British jails, criminals, until lately, were utterly idle; they were crowded together, and lived habitually in the society of each other; intoxication being the only stimulus that was withdrawn. If I wished to invent a school or college for training men to become habitual criminals, I could not imagine an institution more perfect for the purpose than such jails. Men, and often boys, in whom the propensities were naturally strong, were left in complete idleness, so that their strongest and lowest faculties might enjoy ample leisure to luxuriate; and they were placed in each other's society, so that their polluted minds might more effectually avail themselves of their leisure in communicating their experience to each other, and in cultivating, by example and precept, the propensities into increased energy, and more extensive activity.

The proper treatment is to separate them, as much as possible, from each other; and while they are in each other's society, to prevent them, by the most vigilant superintendence, from communicating immoral ideas and impressions to each other's minds. In the next place, they should be all regularly employed; because nothing tends more directly to subdue the inordinate activity of the animal propensities than labour. It occupies the mind, and physiologically it drains off, by the muscles, from the brain, the nervous energy, which, in the case of criminals, is expended by their large organs of the propensities. The greater the number of the higher faculties that the labour stimulates, the more beneficial it will be. Mounting the steps of a treadmill exercises merely the muscles, and acts on the mind by exhausting the nervous energy and producing the feeling of fatigue. It does not excite a single moral or intellectual faculty. Working as a weaver or shoemaker would employ more of the intellectual powers; the occupations of a carpenter or blacksmith are still more ingenious; while that of a machine-maker stands higher still in the scale of mental requirement. Many criminals are so deficient in intellect, that they are not capable of engaging in ingenious employments; but my proposition is, that, wherever they do enjoy intellectual talent, the more effectually it is drawn out, cultivated, and applied to useful purposes, the more will their powers of self-guidance and control be increased.

Supposing the quiescence of the animal propensities to be secured by restraint and by labour, the next object obviously is, to impart vigour to their moral and intellectual faculties, so that they may be rendered capable of mingling with society at a future period, without relapsing into crime. The moral and intellectual faculties can be cultivated only by exercising them on their natural objects, and in their legitimate fields. If any relative of ours possessing an average development of the bones and muscles of the legs, had nevertheless, through sheer indolence, lost the use of them and become incapable of walking, should we act wisely, with a view to his recovery, if we fixed him in an arm-chair, from which it was impossible for him to rise? Yet, when we lock up criminals in prison, amidst beings who never give expression to a moral emotion without its becoming a subject of ridicule; when we exclude from their society all moral and intelligent men calculated to rouse and exercise their higher faculties; and when we provide no efficient means for their instruction; do we not, in fact, as effectually deprive all their superior powers of the means of exercise and improvement, as we would do the patient with feeble legs, by pinioning

him down to a chair? All this must be reversed. Effectual means must be provided for instructing criminals in duty and knowledge, and for exercising their moral and intellectual faculties. This can be done only by greatly increasing the numbers of higher minds that hold communion with them; by rendering their labour the means of purchasing the stores which they consume; and by encouraging them to read and to exercise all their best powers in every practicable manner. The influence of visitors in jails, in ameliorating the character of criminals, is explicable on such grounds. The individuals who undertake this duty are, in general, prompted to it by the vivacity of their own moral feelings; and the manifestation of these towards the criminals excites the corresponding faculties in them into action. On the same principle on which the presence of profligate associates cultivates and strengthens the propensities, does the society of virtuous men excite and strengthen the moral powers.

By this treatment the offender would be restored to society with his inferior feelings tamed, his higher powers invigorated, his understanding enlightened, and his whole mind and body trained to industrious habits. If this should not afford society a more effectual protection against his future crimes, and be more in consonance with the dictates of Christianity than our present treatment, I stand condemned as a vain theorist; but if it would have these blessed effects, I humbly entreat of you to assist me in subduing that spirit of ignorance and dogmatism which represents these views as dangerous to religion and injurious to society, and presents every obstacle to their practical adoption.*

LECTURE XIV.

DUTY OF SOCIETY IN REGARD TO THE TREATMENT OF CRIMINALS.

The punishment of criminals proceeds too much on the principle of revenge—Consequences of this error—The proper objects are the protection of society, and the reformation of the criminal—Means of accomplishing these ends—Confinement in a penitentiary till the offender is rendered capable of good conduct—Experience of the corrupting effects of short periods of imprisonment in Glasgow Bridewell—Effects of simple imprisonment—Effects of Transportation—Examples of humane treatment of criminals in Germany and France—Failure of the treadmill—Suggestion for an improved treatment of transported convicts—American penitentiaries—Punishment of death may ultimately be abolished—Farther particulars respecting American prisons—Results of solitary and social confinement considered—Silent labour system at Auburn.

I proceed to consider the duty of the highest class of minds, in regard to criminal legislation and prison-discipline. This class has received from Providence ample moral and intellectual powers, with as much of the lower elements of our nature as is necessary for their well-being in their present sphere of existence, but not so much as to hurry them into crime. Such individuals have great moral power committed to them by the Creator, and we may presume that he will hold them responsible for the use which they make of it. Hitherto, this class, chiefly through want of knowledge, has fallen far short of

* The prisons in the United States of America are conducted in a manner greatly superior to those of Great Britain and Ireland; but even they admit of improvement. I shall add some remarks on them to the next Lecture.

their duty in the treatment of criminals. In my last Lecture, I remarked, that, as revenge is disavowed by Christianity, and condemned by the moral law of nature, we should exclude it entirely, as a principle, in our treatment of criminals; but that, nevertheless, it may be detected mingling, more or less, with many of our criminal regulations.

Under the existing system of criminal legislation, every man is held responsible for his actions, who, in the phrasology of lawyers, can distinguish between right and wrong; and this responsibility consists in being subjected to a certain extent of punishment—in other words, mental and physical suffering—proportioned to the magnitude of the offence which he has committed. Although even in the metaphysical schools of philosophy it is generally admitted, that the impulsive, and also the intellectual faculties, are distinct in their characteristics, and do not exist in fixed and definite proportions to each other in every individual, yet these facts, and the consequences which flow from them, have been and are disregarded by our criminal legislators. An individual may be born with so strong an instinct of acquisitiveness and such weak moral and intellectual powers, that, like a fox on a common, he may be actually impelled by his nature to appropriate objects suited to gratify his propensity, regardless of the preferable rights of others; or he may be destructive or deceptive in his tendencies—prompted by strong internal impulse to take away life, or to commit fraud; but the law takes no cognizance of his mental constitution. He may be grossly ignorant; he may be undergoing the pangs of starvation; or he may be surrounded by the temptations presented by intoxicating liquors and a social atmosphere of ignorance and profligacy; still the law takes no account of such things. It inquires only whether he possesses so much intellect as to know that it has declared stealing, killing, fire-raising, fraud, deception, and hundreds of other acts, to be *wrong*. If he is not purely idiotic or raving mad, he may be in any of the unfortunate conditions now mentioned, and yet know this fact. And this is enough for the law. It, then, by a fiction of its own, and often in opposition to the most glaring indications, assumes him to be a free and responsible being, and deals out its punishment, in other words its *vengeance*, upon him for having disregarded its dictates. It makes no inquiry into the *effects* of its inflictions on his mind. Strong in its own *fiction* that he is a free, moral, and responsible being, it aims at no object except deterring its subjects from actions injurious to society, and assumes that *suffering* is the best or only means necessary to accomplish this end; and punish him it does accordingly.

In committing men to prisons in which they shall be doomed to idleness,—in compelling them to associate, night and day, with each other (the most effectual method of eradicating any portion of moral feeling left unimpaired in their minds),—and in omitting to provide instruction for them,—society seems, without intending it, to proceed almost exclusively on the principle of revenge. Such treatment may be painful, but it is clearly not beneficial to the criminals; and yet pain, deliberately inflicted, without benefit to the sufferer, is simply vengeance. Perhaps it may be thought that this treatment will serve to render imprisonment more terrible, and thereby increase its efficacy as a means of deterring other men from offending. No doubt it will render it very terrible to virtuous men,—to individuals of the highest class of natural dispositions,—because nothing could be more horrible to them than to be confined in idleness, amidst vicious, ~~debased~~, and profligate associates; but this is not the class on whom prisons are intended to operate as objects of terror;

these men have few temptations to become criminals. Those to whom prisons should be rendered formidable, are the lovers of pleasure, men enamoured of an easy dissolute life, enlivened with animal excitement, not oppressed with labour, nor saddened by care, reflection, or moral restraint. Our prisons, as recently conducted, were not formidable to such characters. They promised them idleness, the absence of care, and the stimulus of profligate society. On this class of minds, therefore, they, in a great degree, lost the character of objects of terror and aversion; undeniably they were not schools of reform; and they therefore had no recognisable feature so strongly marked on them as that of instruments of vengeance, or means employed by the higher minds, for inflicting on their inferior brethren what, judging from their own feelings, they intend to be a terrible retribution, but which these lower characters, from the difference of their feelings, found to be no formidable punishment at all. Thus, through ignorance of human nature, the one class continued to indulge its revenge, in the vain belief that it was deterring offenders; while the other class proceeded in its career of crime, in nearly utter disregard of the measures adopted to deter it from iniquity; and at this day, although important improvements have been effected in prisons, criminal legislation is still far from being crowned with success.

If any class deserve punishment for these proceedings, I would be disposed to inflict it on the higher class, or on the men to whom a bountiful Creator has given ample ability to reclaim their less fortunate brethren from vice and crime, but who, through ignorance, and the helplessness that accompanies it, leave this great duty undischarged. In point of fact, the natural law does punish them, and will continue to punish them, until they adopt the right method of proceeding. If we reckon up the cost, in the destruction of life and property, expenses of maintaining criminal officers, courts of justice, and executioners,—and the pangs of sorrow, flowing not only from pecuniary loss, but from disgrace, sustained by the relatives of profligate offenders,—we may regard the sum-total as the penalty which the virtuous pay for their neglect of the rational principles of criminal legislation. If the sums thus expended were collected and applied, under the guidance of enlightened judgment, to the construction and proper appointment of penitentiaries, one or more for each large district of the country, and if offenders were committed to them for reformation, it is probable that the total loss to society would not be greater than that of the present system, while the advantages would unspeakably exceed those which now exist.

In regard to the treatment of criminals when placed in such penitentiaries, I have already remarked, that, in the sentences pronounced under the present system, the principle chiefly, although unintentionally, acted on by the superior class of society, appears to be revenge. If a boy rob a till of a few pence, he is sentenced to eight days' imprisonment in jail; that is, to eight days' idleness, passed in the society of accomplished thieves and profligate blackguards, at the end of which space he is liberated. Here the quantity of punishment measured out seems to be regulated by the principle, that the eight days' confinement causes a quantity of suffering equal to a fair retribution for robbing the till. If a female steal clothes from a hedge, she is sentenced to sixty days' confinement in Bridewell, where she is forced to work, in the society of ten or a dozen of profligates like herself, during the day, and is locked up alone during the night. At the end of the sixty days she is liberated, and turned adrift on society. If a man commit a more extensive theft, he is com

mitted to Bridewell for three months, or perhaps transported; the term of confinement and the period of transportation bearing a uniform, and, as far as possible, a supposed just relation to the magnitude of the offence. The intention of this treatment is to cause a quantum of suffering sufficient to deter the criminal from repeating the offence, and also others from committing similar transgressions; but we shall inquire whether these effects follow.

If we renounce, altogether, the principle of vengeance as unsound, we shall still have other two principles remaining as guides to our steps: first, that of protecting society; and, secondly, that of reforming the offender.

The principle of protecting society authorizes us to do everything that is necessary to accomplish this end, under the single qualification that we shall adopt that method which is most beneficial to society, and least injurious to the criminal. If, as I have contended, the world be really constituted on the principle of the supremacy of the moral sentiments, we shall find, that whatever measures serve best to protect the public interests, will also be most beneficial for the offender, and *vice versa*. In the view, then, of social protection, any individual who has been convicted of infringing the criminal law, should be handed over, as a moral patient, to the managers of a well-regulated penitentiary, to be confined in it, not until he shall have endured a certain quantity of suffering, equal in magnitude to what is supposed to be a fair revenge for his offence, but until such a change shall have been effected in his mental condition, as may afford society a reasonable guarantee that he will not commit fresh crimes when he is set at large. It is obvious that this course of procedure would be humanity itself to the offender, compared with the present system, while it would unspeakably benefit society. It would convert our prisons from houses of retribution and of corruption, into schools of reform. It would require, however, an entire change in the principles on which they are conducted.

The views which I have expounded in this and the preceding Lecture are strongly elucidated and confirmed by a report of the state of the Glasgow Bridewell in 1826, which I obtained from the late Mr Brebner, the enlightened and truly humane superintendent of that establishment:—

STATE OF CRIMES AND OFFENCES.

	Year ending 31st Dec. 1826.			Year ending 31st Dec. 1826.		
	Males.	Females.	Total.	Males.	Females.	Total.
Commitments during the year,	558	703	1261	688	713	1401
Deduct recommitments of the same individual in the currency of the year,	101	279	380	124	281	405
Remains nett number of different persons,	457	424	881	564	432	996
Whereof in custody for the first time,	360	208	568	444	180	624
Old offenders	97	215	312	120	243	363

Mr Brebner has observed that offenders committed for the first time, for only a short period, almost invariably return to Bridewell for new offences; but if committed for a long period, they return less frequently. This fact is established by the following

table, framed on an average of ten years, ending 25th December 1825.

Of prisoners sentenced for the first time to 14 days' confinement, there returned under sentence for new crimes about 75 per cent.

30 days' confinement, about	60	---
40	50	---
60	40	---
3 months'	25	---
6	10	---
9	7½	---
12	---	---
18	1	---
24	none.	---

During the ten years, 93 persons were committed for the first time for two years, of whom not one returned.

Mr Brebner remarked, that when prisoners come back to Bridewell two or three times, they go on returning at intervals for years. He has observed that a good many prisoners committed for short periods for first offences, are afterwards tried before the High Court of Justiciary and transported or hanged.

Judging from the ultimate effect, we here discover that the individuals who for some petty offence are committed to Bridewell for the first time, for only 14 days, are in reality more severely punished than those who, for some more grave infringement of the law, are sentenced at first to two years' imprisonment; nay, the ultimate result to the petty delinquent would have been far more beneficial, if for his trifling offence he had been sentenced to two years' confinement instead of 14 days. The sentence of 14 days' imprisonment merely destroyed his moral sensibilities (if he had any), initiated him into the mysteries of a prison, introduced him to accomplished thieves, and enabled him to profit by their instruction; and, when thus deteriorated, and also deprived of all remnants of character, it turned him loose again into the world, unprotected and unprovided for, leaving him to commit new crimes and to undergo new punishments (which we see by the table he rarely failed to do), until, by gradual corruption, he was ultimately prepared for transportation or the galleys. Of the delinquents sentenced to only 14 days' confinement for their first offence, 75 per cent., or three-fourths of the whole, returned for new crimes. On the other hand, the training, discipline, and ameliorating effect of a confinement for two years, for the first offence, seems to have been so efficacious, that not one individual who had been subjected to it, returned again to the same prison as a criminal.* This proves that, looking to the ultimate welfare of the individuals themselves, as well as to the interests of society, there is far greater humanity in a sentence for a first offence, that shall reform the culprit, although the offence itself may be small and the confinement long, than in one decreeing punishment for a few days only, proportional solely to the amount of the crime.

The chief forms in which the law punishes, are confinement in prisons (until very lately in idleness and amidst vicious associates), and, in more aggravated cases, transportation to a penal colony.

I present the following example of the effects of imprisonment on the minds of a male and female offender. It appeared in the London *Weekly Chronicle* of 26th January 1845, and is only one of a thousand similar illustrations which could easily be

* Mr Brebner mentioned that he did not believe that all of these individuals were completely reclaimed; but that they had received such impressions of Glasgow prison-discipline, that, if disposed to return to crime, they sought out a new field of action.

collected from the records of the prisons of the United Kingdom.

"**HISTORY OF A COINER.**—A woman, named Mulhern alias Lockwood, was committed in Lancaster last week, on a charge of coining and uttering counterfeit coin : and we now proceed to give some particulars of her truly eventful history, with which Mr Powell, the solicitor to the Mint, has obligingly furnished us.

"The first that is known of her is as the wife of a soldier serving under Sir John Moore in Spain, and whom she followed to the field—trudging along with the army and its gallant leader through its long and remarkable retreat, till the battle of Corunna. After this, she was with the army under 'the Duke' in Portugal, and during the whole of the Peninsular war, whether merely as a camp-follower or with her husband is not known; but he is supposed to have been killed in some of the many engagements that took place, and she to have consoled herself with another, if not many more. In one engagement with the enemy, the serjeant-major of the regiment she followed was killed by a shot; on which (while, it is imagined, the engagement still continued) she contrived to get at the body, and rifle the dead man's 'kit' of its contents. Among these were his marriage and other certificates, which she carefully concealed and preserved for after use. On returning home she passed herself off as the widow of this serjeant-major, in order to obtain a pension; and afterwards, on a nurse's place in Chelsea Hospital becoming vacant, she applied for, and obtained it, also as the serjeant-major's widow; having all the necessary documents, she was enabled to answer every question, and her identity was never doubted. But, when she had been comfortably located here for some time, the real widow came home! Her application for a pension, its denial on the ground that the widow was already provided for, and the real widow's reiterated assertions that she was the widow, caused an investigation by the late Sir Charles Grant. The result was, that Biddy was turned adrift on the 'wide world,' and was lost sight of for several years. Her first reappearance was in the character of a coinier, as which she was tried and convicted in 1828, and sentenced to a year's imprisonment. In 1834 she was again tried; but this time under the name of Lockwood, and in company with her second husband, whose real name, however, was Stafford, and who was a very skilful mason by trade. He was convicted, and she was then acquitted as being his wife, and supposed to be acting under his direction. In 1836 she was convicted at Aylesbury for coining, and she then said she was fifty-five years of age. She was again tried for the same offence at Warwick in 1838, but acquitted, owing to the insufficiency of evidence; and in July of the same year she was again tried, and this time in connection with a woman named Eliza Perceval, the offence being the same. Lockwood (prisoner) got eighteen months' imprisonment, and her companion twelve months. From that time till the present apprehension of Mrs Mulhern alias Lockwood, &c., Mr Powell had almost entirely lost sight of her; sometimes he thought he recognised her business talent in the different cases forwarded to him, but was not able to follow out the clue. In the answers she now gave to the questions contained in the 'Description Paper,' prisoner had in almost every case given false statements, not wishing, doubtless, to renew her acquaintance with the Mint solicitor; and when confronted with him, she stoutly denied all previous knowledge of Mr Powell, till he mentioned one or two 'passages' in her life, when she said, 'Ah! ——— told you that tale!'

"In 1821, Lockwood (her husband) was convicted at the Surrey assizes of coining, &c., and sentenced to one year's imprisonment. In 1833 he was convicted at Warwick, and sentenced to six months' imprisonment. The following year he was tried and convicted at Stafford, and sent to gaol for one year. For the next three years little or nothing was heard of him; but in 1838 he was tried at Warwick, where he got three months' imprisonment; and in January 1839, he was tried at Gloucester, and sentenced to a year's imprisonment. Lastly, he was apprehended at Abingdon in the following, or the year after that, with a woman of the name of Harriet Thompson—whom he had taken to supply the place of his wife on her being sent to prison for eighteen months; and on the 25th of January he was transported for life, and she (Thompson) was imprisoned for two years. Ann Lockwood, if we recollect aright, was not actually aware of her husband's fate till she saw Mr Powell in Leicester gaol. At the expiration of her term a subscription was raised to enable the woman Thompson to follow her 'husband' to Sydney, and she arrived there safely. In October last the governor of Abingdon gaol had received a letter from her, stating that 'James' (Lockwood or Thompson) was regularly employed by the chief builders at Sydney, and at good wages; while she had also obtained profitable employment. He, it seems, is very clever as a workman in Gothic architecture, and at cutting out grotesque heads and other ornaments for Churches."

The *Chronicle*, which reports this case, adds, "The above sketch of the strange lives of two coiners furnishes a striking commentary on the utter inutility of mere punishment, as deterring from the future commission of crime; and should the present or any future solicitor to the Mint ever make known to the world the 'curiosities of his legal experience,' that world would be astonished to find with what utter recklessness these sons and daughters of crime have looked upon the violent and ignominious death of their most intimate companion."

If the existence and character of a cause is to be judged of from its effects, no person capable of reasoning can doubt, that although this husband and wife were both capable of distinguishing intellectually between right and wrong, there was in their minds some strong tendency to wrong (although perceived to be wrong), which all the religious, moral, and intellectual training that they had received,—all the influence of public opinion that had reached them,—and all the terrors of the law which they had either heard of or experienced,—had failed to eradicate or control. From these premises, unbiassed reason would conclude that they were not free moral agents, but *moral patients*, whose cases needed restraint and treatment for cure, much more than punishment in the form of vengeance or retribution. I repeat that the assumption of the law that they are free moral agents, is purely a *fiction*, directly contradicted by facts; and in my opinion, those personages who, in enacting our laws, create this fiction and persist in acting upon it, in the face of positive demonstration of its mischievous effects, are responsible to God and man for all its painful consequences.

The following description of the penal colonies in Australia shows what the consequences of the second form of punishment—*transportation*—really are. Captain Macconochie, late superintendent of Norfolk Island, in his account of "The Management of Prisoners in the Penal Colonies," printed in 1846, but not published, but which I am authorised to cite, remarks—"That the attention of the British Government, and of the public, has of late years

been much directed to this subject, and many changes have been introduced into the arrangements for the management of convicts in the penal colonies; but these have related chiefly to details in the administration, leaving the *principles* very slightly, if at all, improved. Indeed, the inevitable operation of the prevailing principles on the minds of the convicts has not yet been sufficiently understood. Only a deeply-interested eye-witness (says Captain M.) can thoroughly appreciate their effects; and only a practised hand can successfully develop better principles on which a new system may be advantageously founded. Captain M., besides being conversant with Phrenology, has enjoyed the advantage of eight years' study and observation in the penal colonies, during the last four of which he had the principal charge of the prisoners in Norfolk Island. He possesses, therefore, high qualifications for portraying faithfully things as they are, and for suggesting how they may be improved.

He describes the errors of the existing system to be the following:—

1. "It measures its sentences by time, with little or no reference to conduct during that time." The young, the single, the careless, reckless, and profligate, care little about the loss of time; while the middle-aged, the married, the provident, and the ambitious, feel it strongly, and would make great exertions to shorten the duration of their sentences, if means were afforded by good conduct to do so. At present the constant thought, even of the best men, is how their time may be whiled away with the least possible discomfort.

2. It errs in "punishing by compulsory labour, in the due performance of which the men have no individual interest." This gives a disgust to labour, and impairs all industrious tendencies in the convict; it cultivates every original and acquired capacity for deceit or evasion; and in extreme cases leads even to mutilating the person to avoid work. Slovenly and imperfect execution of work is another consequence; and even the good men *dare not* resist the *esprit de corps* of the mass, which is constantly, through its interests, directed to idleness. A man who should "furnish in his own person a measure by which to estimate the exertions of others, might reasonably fear injury, whether he actually sustained it or not."

Through these two circumstances, "a vast school of evasion and deceit, of craving after sensual indulgence, and snatching at it when it offers, however criminal and even disgusting sometimes its character, is formed in the penal colonies."

3. Another error is, "the allowance to all of fixed rations of food and clothing, whether labour and good conduct are rendered for them or not." Their employments are generally irksome to them, and often studiously (although most unwisely) made so by the principles of the system. Here, then, through labour that is irksome, and food supplied irrespective of performing it, is a premium offered to idleness; and as idleness can be reached only by deceit and imposition on their taskmasters, a fresh stimulus is given to the practice of falsehood. Their occasional success in deception encourages them, while their occasional detection and punishment irritate and stimulate them, like gamblers, "to try again."

4. "Another error of the system is of a precisely opposite character to this, yet it is not less injurious. Certain periods are fixed when prisoners may apply for specific indulgences; "but their applications may be granted or refused at will; and when granted, the results may, in most cases, be also cancelled at will." The officers employed are greatly attached to this part of the system, as investing them with

what they regard to be a salutary influence, authority, and control, over the convicts. Captain M. views its effects very differently. "Placed (says he) as little gods in the communities in which they move, they become tyrannical and capricious almost of necessity." "By flattering their weaknesses (and no man is without some), it impairs insensibly the better parts of their character, and brings into prominence the worse. I say all this (continues Captain M.) the more frankly, because I include myself among those spoken of;—and during my four years' command at Norfolk Island, nothing was more continually before me than the progressive deterioration to which I was thus subjected." The evil effects on the men are equally apparent. "Every feeling of self-dependence is speedily lost in a universal relying on favour, hypocrisy, and fawning, playing on the weaknesses of others, and not studying, by patient diligence and integrity, to deserve and reap their due rewards."

5. Under the existing system, the men are almost universally indecently lodged. "They are now, for the most part, accumulated in rooms containing from fifty to one hundred and fifty each, usually without light, and without other convenience than night tubs for the relief of the wants of nature." The injurious effects are most deplorable. "Personal reserve and delicacy are speedily banished; the most disgusting scenes become familiar;"—I cannot proceed with the quotation: the picture is completed in these words—all are "reduced to a common low level; and the actual level is, on this point, low almost beyond conception; it is exhibited in their language, habits, feelings—every thing!" Better accommodation, says Captain M., would not now stop this monstrous evil. "It is interwoven with the whole state of degradation to which these men are subjected, and can be removed only with it." A partial remedy would be found no remedy at all.

6. The deep degradation of the convicts, consequent on all these circumstances, is the next evil of the present system. Captain Maconochie gives a view of their moral state, which is truly appalling. Their low condition prompts the officers to overlook all their interests, and in the administration of justice among them to treat them with "culpable negligence and severity;" to disregard their natural feelings, and to subject them "to much harsh and contumelious language." The individual being thus degraded in the eyes of others, speedily loses his own self-respect also, yields without restraint to present temptation, and falls into a state of "almost inconceivable wickedness." Despairing of earning the approbation of the free community with which he is associated, "he naturally falls back on his own class, and the more prizes its sympathy and approval instead. In this manner is generated a strong and even tyrannical public opinion among the convicts themselves," a school in which "courage, patience, daring, self-sacrifice, and fidelity," are often elicited, but "uniformly directed against the Government and the interests of free society." The approbation which they obtain "confirms the tendency to reckless daring," a quality which, "more or less, characterises all prisoners, and without which they would probably have been scared by the first threatenings of the law, and would have escaped its toils." The concluding remark on this point is of the highest practical importance: it is as follows—"As a feature in the criminal character, this daring is, not, I think, sufficiently adverted to by those who advocate the attempt to deter from crime by severe punishments. *Temper under its influence feel themselves only challenged, both in their own eyes and those of their companions, by the recurrence of these.*" However strange it may appear to those unacquainted with the sub-

ject, yet "crime thrives on severe examples," and "most certainly in direct competition with them."

7. The present system operates *de facto* as if it had been expressly contrived to accomplish the moral ruin of the men. The individual is condemned for seven, fourteen, twenty-one years, or a whole lifetime, to the influence of these circumstances, and *no moral or religious conduct* can extricate him from them. The "good conduct" for which a pardon may be obtained, consists in "shooting a bush-ranger, betraying a comrade, or otherwise, with or without risk, promoting what is considered an adequate government object!" They are "among the worst men who are so benefited; and there is *no example that I am aware of, of the milder and more domestic virtues being similarly rewarded.*" Nor is this a fault in the administration of the system, but is essential to itself!" The results are next stated. "It is astonishing how rapid is the progress of deterioration. I have seen fine promising young men, and comparatively innocent, in a few months pass through every degree of wickedness; and, in fact, I have observed that it is the young, and otherwise the most interesting, who generally fall both fastest and farthest."—"It is notorious in the penal colonies that the new arrivals are much better generally than the older prisoners, though they speedily acquire all their evil ways; but such an ascendancy is given to all that is evil in the management to which after their arrival they are subjected, such fetters are thrown by it over all good, such scope is afforded for the development of bad passions, so narrow is the sphere for every virtue, except submissiveness, not in itself a virtue at all, but rather a weakness, preparing for evil influence as much or more than for good direction," that "any set of men in the world would be ruined," and "even the most virtuous and intelligent in the kingdom would speedily be destroyed by it." "I willingly admit that an aspect of external decency is maintained by the discipline imposed, which veils much of the real effect from superficial observation; but the facts here stated are indisputable."

Nor does the evil end with the prisoners; for in society the ruin of one class necessarily involves the deep injury of every other. "Wild beasts as these men are made, weak and wicked as they become, they are the labourers in the penal colonies, and rise, many of them, to be small tenants and proprietors in them. They carry with them to their new sphere the vices of their old condition. They enter the market prepared to take any advantage that may offer; and while they thus lie, steal, rob, or defraud, as it may happen, it is too often thought fair by others to meet them with their own weapons, and 'diamond cut diamond' becomes thus a general rule. Meanwhile, the harder and more enterprising of them (generally the worst, and in such cases no language can over-rate their wickedness) effect their escape, or otherwise leave the colonies, and spread over the Pacific." Everywhere "they rob, they murder, they steal, they commit every excess that comes in their way, they catch at every passing sensual enjoyment, they gratify every brutal appetite, they revenge their quarrel with their native country (their just quarrel I will venture confidently to call it), by trampling where they have the power on every feeling of humanity and every interest of civilisation!"

No words can add strength to the terrible features of this representation. Society owes a debt of gratitude to Captain Maconochie for having lifted up the veil and shewn us the monstrous evil in all its hideousness and horrors.

If the humane principles which I now advocate shall ever be adopted (and I feel confident that they will), the sentence of the criminal judge, on conviction

of a crime, should simply declare that the individual had committed a certain offence, and that he was not fit to live at large in society: It should contain a warrant for his transmission to a penitentiary, to be there confined, instructed, and employed, until liberated in due course of law. The treatment in prison and the process of liberation would then become the objects of greatest importance. There should be official inspectors of penitentiaries, invested with some of the powers of a court, sitting at regular intervals, and proceeding according to fixed rules. They should be authorized to receive applications for liberation at all their sessions, and to grant the prayer of them, on being satisfied that such a thorough change had been effected in the mental condition of the prisoner, that he might safely be permitted to resume his place in society. Until this conviction was produced, upon examination of his dispositions, of his attainments in knowledge, of his acquired skill in some useful employment, of his habits of industry, and, in short, of his general qualifications to provide for his own support, to restrain his animal propensities from committing abuses, and to act the part of a useful citizen, he should be retained as an inmate of the prison. Perhaps some individuals, whose dispositions appeared favourable to reformation, might be liberated at an earlier period, on sufficient security, under bond, given by responsible relatives or friends, for the discharge of the same duties towards them in private, which the officers of the penitentiary would discharge in public. For example, if a youth were to commit such an offence as would subject him, according to the present system of criminal legislation, to two or three months' confinement in Bridewell, he might be handed over to individuals of undoubtedly good character and substance, under a bond that they should be answerable for his proper education, employment, and reformation; and fulfilment of this obligation should be very rigidly enforced. The principle of revenge being disavowed and abandoned, there could be no harm in following any mode of treatment, whether private or public, that should be adequate to the accomplishment of the other two objects of criminal legislation—the protection of society and the reformation of the offender. To prevent abuses of this practice, the public authorities should carefully ascertain that the natural qualities of the offender admitted of adequate improvement by private treatment; and, secondly, that private discipline was actually administered. If any offender liberated on bond should ever reappear as a criminal, the penalty should be inexorably enforced, and the culprit should never again be liberated, except upon a verdict finding that his reformation, had been completed by a proper term of training in a penitentiary.

This plan, or one closely resembling it, has been tried in Germany with the best effects. At the village of Horn, near Hamburg, there is a house of refuge for juvenile offenders of both sexes, named Das Raube Haus. It consists of several plain inexpensive buildings, situated in a field of a few acres, without walls, fences, bolts, bars, or gates. It is supported by subscription, and the annual cost for each individual in 1837, when I visited it, was L.10, 4s. sterling. It then contained 54 inmates, of whom 13 were girls. A portion of them were offenders who had been condemned by the courts of law for crimes, and suffered the punishment allotted to them in the house of correction, and who afterwards, with the consent of their parents, had come voluntarily to the institution for the sake of reformation. Another portion of them consisted of young culprits apprehended for first offences, and whose parents, rather than have them tried and dealt with

according to law, subscribed a contract by which the youths were delivered over for a number of years to this establishment for amendment. And a third portion consisted of children of evil dispositions, whose parents voluntarily applied to have them received into the institution, for the reformation of their vicious habits. Among this last class I saw the son of a German nobleman, who had been sent to it as a last resource, and who was treated in every respect like the other inmates, and with marked success. The inmates are retained if necessary, till they attain the age of 22. They are instructed in reading, writing, and religion, and are taught a trade. There is a master for every twelve, who never leaves them night or day. The plan of the treatment is that of parental affection mingled with strict and steady discipline, in which punishments are used for reformation, but never with injurious severity. The teachers are drawn chiefly from the lower classes of society; and the head manager, Candidat Wicher, an unbenighted clergyman, himself belonging to this class, and thus became thoroughly acquainted with the feelings, manners, and temptations of the pupils. When I visited the establishment, he possessed unlimited authority, and shed around him the highest and purest influences from his own beautifully moral and intellectual mind. He mentioned that only once had an attempt at crime been projected. A few of the worst boys laid a plan to burn the whole institution, and selected the time of his wife's expected confinement, when they supposed that his attention would be much engaged with her. One of them, however, revealed the design, and it was frustrated. There are very few attempts at escape; and when the reformed inmates leave the establishment, the directors use their influence to find for them situations and employments in which they may be useful, and exposed to as few temptations as possible. The plan had been in operation for four years, at the time of my visit, and I understand that it continues to flourish with unabated prosperity.

Another instance of the successful application of rational and humane principles is afforded by "La Colonie Agricole et Penitentielle de Mettray," about four and a half miles from Tours, in France. It is described in the *Journal de la Société de la Morale Chrétienne*, for September 1844, and is contrasted by Captain Maconochie with his own system, in an appendix to the documents formerly mentioned.

It was founded in 1839, for the reception of young delinquents, who, under a special provision to that effect, are acquitted of their offences (as our lunatics are) *comme ayant agi sans discernement* (as having acted without discernment), but are sentenced to specific periods of *correctional discipline* before their final discharge. It was founded, and is still to a considerable extent maintained, by voluntary contributions—one benevolent individual, Count Leon d'Ourches, having endowed it during his lifetime with 150,000 francs, and the King and Royal Family, the Ministers of the Interior, of Justice, and of Instruction, with many public bodies and private individuals, having also liberally contributed.

The principles of management are the following:—

1. A *social or family spirit* (*esprit de famille*) is sedulously instilled into the pupils, as opposed to the selfish or merely gregarious spirit usually created in large assemblies of criminals.

2. For this purpose, the boys are divided into small sections or families, with common interests and tasks.

3. In all other respects they are placed in circumstances as much as possible resembling those of free life; and are led to submit to the strict order,

obedience, and other discipline imposed on them, by appeals to their judgment, interests, and feelings, rather than by direct coercion. Corporeal punishment, in particular, is avoided in regard to them.

4. A carefully impressed religious education is given to them, with as much purely intellectual culture as may comport with their proposed future condition as labourers. Reading, writing, arithmetic, linear drawing, and music, are considered to constitute the requisite branches.

Lastly, Their employments consist chiefly of those connected with agricultural and country life; a strong wish being entertained that they should settle to these on being discharged, rather than return to dense societies.

Before coming to this institution, the boys undergo a rigorous penitentiary discipline in the central prisons, to which they much dread returning. Without this, the fatigue and moral restraints imposed on them by the directors, would make them desire to return to their idle and comparatively comfortable life in the common prison. Expulsion, and, in consequence, a return to the severe penitentiary discipline, is the greatest punishment which is inflicted, and it is sufficient. There are a head-master and two assistants, and a separate house for every forty boys. "The boys are further divided into four sections or sub-families, who elect every quarter an elder brother (*frère aîné*), who assists the masters, and exercises a delegated authority under them. We attach much importance," say the directors, "to his situation being thus made elective. Knowing the boys as we do, we can tell the dispositions of each section from his choice."

The labour imposed on the inmates is all useful. "In England they use crank and tread-wheels for exercise; but our criminals universally object to this, and express great indignation at being set, as they call it, 'to grind the air' (*moudre l'air*). We find it of much importance that our occupations, whether ordinary or for punishment, produce a sensible result." There is equal humanity and reason in this observation. (Criminals can be reformed only by strengthening their moral and intellectual faculties; and, "grinding the air" on treadmills, whatever effect it may produce on the calves of their legs, seems little calculated to improve their brains. The treadmill, by not only dispensing with, but absolutely excluding, all thought and moral feeling, and exhausting both mind and body in sheer aimless fatigue, is calculated first to exasperate, and ultimately to blunt whatever little mental power the individuals may have carried with them into prison.

"Before inflicting any punishment," continues the Report, "we are very anxious both to be perfectly calm ourselves, and to have the culprit toned down to submission and acquiescence in the justice of our sentence." "On grave occasions we also frequently assemble a jury of his companions to hear and decide on his case, reserving to ourselves only the right of mitigating any punishment awarded by them. *It is remarkable that these young people always err on the side of severity.*" Captain Maconochie highly approves of "Prisoner Juries" for the trial of prisoners, as calculated to interest the body of them in the administration of justice, to break down their otherwise natural opposition to it, and to assist in attaining truth. "They should, however," says he, "judge only of the fact, and not of the fitting sentence on it. *All rude minds are inclined to severity.*" The greatest harshness, he adds, of naval and military officers who have risen from the ranks, compared with those who have always held an elevated position, "*is proverbial.*" The principle involved in this fact extends through every branch of society. The excellent but stern moralists who, in the social

circles of life, in parliament, and at public meetings, advocate severe punishments, are, in this respect, "rude minds." There is in them a lurking element of resentment and revenge, which, however restrained in their general conduct in society, prompts them, unconsciously to themselves, when they come to think of criminals, to distrust the efficacy of moral treatment, and to exaggerate the advantages of severe inflictions.

In the Mettray Institution, "we use the cell to prepare for our other influences, to enable our pupils to recover from the turbulence of excited feeling, and sometimes also to lay a foundation of instruction, when little aptitude for it is exhibited amidst a crowd. It is in a cell, too, that religious impressions are most easily and certainly conveyed, and that first habits of industry may be formed." Captain Maconochie entirely subscribes to this opinion, provided that the time thus spent be not too long, and that this treatment be not considered as capable of constituting a complete moral course.

"From the second year of our establishment, we think that we may say that vice had become unpopular, and the bad were under the influence of the good." "The cause of our success has been the application of two fruitful ideas—the substitution of a domestic or family spirit in our pupils, instead of one proceeding from more gregarious association, and the seeking from moral influences the restraints which other systems look for in walls, bolts, chains, and severe punishments."

The result of this statement is stated thus:—"The institution has received in all 411 children, of whom 102 have been discharged. Of these latter, 4 have been re-convicted (June 1844); 1 has been apprehended and awaits a new trial; 6 are considered only of middling conduct; but 79 are irreproachable. Of the remaining 12 nothing is known."

If such a system were adopted in this country, a sound and serviceable philosophy of mind would be of importance, to guide the footsteps of judges, managers, inspectors, liberating officers, and criminals themselves. Without such a philosophy, the treatment would be empirical, the results unsatisfactory, and the public disappointment great.

If, keeping the principles which I have explained in view, you read attentively the various systems of prison discipline which have been tried, you will discover in all of them some lurking defect in one essential particular or another, and perceive that their success has been great or small in proportion as they have approached to, or receded from, these principles. A few years ago, there was a rage for treadmills in prisons; these were expected to accomplish great effects. The phrenologist laughed at the idea and predicted its failure, for the simplest reason: Crime proceeds from over-active propensities and under-active moral sentiments; and all that the treadmill could boast of accomplishing, was to fatigue the muscles of the body, leaving the propensities and moral sentiments, after the fatigue was removed by rest, in a condition exactly similar to that in which they had been before it was inflicted. The advocates of the treadmill proceeded on the theory, that the irksomeness of the labour would terrify the offenders so much, that if they had once undergone it, they would refrain from crime during their whole lives, to avoid encountering it again. This notion, however was without sufficient foundation. The labour, although painful at the time, did not, in the least, remove the causes of crime; and after the pain had ceased, these continued to operate, offences were repeated, and treadmills have now fallen considerably into disrepute.

Captain Maconochie, who has been long acquainted

with Phrenology, proposes the following improvements, in accordance with the views now advocated, in the treatment of transported convicts:—Two sentences should be pronounced against convicted criminals—first, banishment for 7, 10, 15, or other term of years, from the parent country; and, secondly, *hard labour in a penal settlement until discharged under its regulations.* The two sentences should have no necessary dependence on each other. The expatriation should be considered as imposed to protect the society that has been injured from the early return of one who has shewn himself weak amidst the temptations incident to it. The discipline in the penal settlement should be maintained until this weakness is converted into strength. Like a patient in an hospital, the convict should not be discharged at the expiry of a term, *unless cured.*

Captain Maconochie states confidently, from much experience, that the mixture of a free and convict population, while the latter is still in a state of bondage, is fatal to both. The administration of justice is impaired by its dependence on colonial interests and prejudices, and becomes inconsistent; while its importance is lost sight of amidst a variety of other questions, interests, and details. The expense, also, is greatly increased by the heavy police—judicial, military, and executive—which is indispensable to keep down the confusion, abuse, and crime, thus created. "Penal settlements, therefore, should be separated from free colonies altogether, and not even be subject to them, but be kept in direct correspondence with the Government at home." Captain M. attaches great importance to this point.

His suggestions for the improved management of penal settlements are the following:—

1. The sentence, besides prescribing a term of banishment, should impose a fine (graduated according to the offence), which the convict should be required to redeem exclusively by labour and good conduct; a sum being placed to his credit daily as wages, according to his behaviour, or charged to his debit, if he neglected his labour, or otherwise offended. This fine should, in no case, be dischargeable by a mere payment in money, obtained by the convict from any source besides his own labour and good conduct in prison. Indeed, to do away with every idea of this kind, Captain M. proposes that "a factitious debt of 6000, 8000, or 10,000 marks should be created against every man, according to his offence," and be redeemable in the manner now mentioned, and that these marks should exercise all the functions of money in relation to him.

2. No ration, except bread and water, should be allowed to him of right; for everything else he should be charged in marks, as the representative of money.

3. He should be allowed to expend the marks he has earned for necessaries, or even for present indulgences, at his discretion, but never to obtain his discharge till, from his labour and economy combined (both voluntary), he should have fully redeemed the sum charged against him in his sentence.

It seems almost unnecessary to contrast this system with the one now in operation. In the present one, everything tends to evil: in the one proposed, everything would tend to good. The introduction of a representative of wages, to be earned by the convict's labour and good conduct, would give him an interest in exertion, and present motives for self-control. These alone would change entirely the character of the convict's condition. "They would remove that taint of slavery which, at present, corrupts every portion of it. The absence of fixed rations, also, irrespective of exertion or conduct, would further improve the men. Under both stimulants, they would give twice the amount of labour that they do now, with half the superintendence; and this alone would make

their maintenance much more economical." As a farther strengthener of the motives to good conduct, the utmost certainty should be given in prisons to the operation of the system of marks. A reward earned should unfailingly be given, and a fine incurred by neglect or misconduct, should unfailingly be exacted. There should be as little discretion in regard to either as possible, in order that the men may speedily learn to look on themselves as the architects of their own fortune, and not to trust to deception, evasion, and playing on the weaknesses of others, as means of escaping from labour or shortening the periods of their confinement. Voluntary labour and economy, thus practically enforced (as the only means by which the convicts could ever obtain their liberty), would tend to cultivate in them habits of activity and self-command, the most important preparations for a return to freedom. By this means, also, the sense of justice and honesty, and the habit of connecting enjoyment with virtuous action, and suffering with negligence and vice, would be fostered; while the certainty of the consequences of their own conduct would contribute towards steadying their minds, and eradicating that gambling spirit which is so characteristic of the convict class, and which at present everything tends to encourage.

4. During a period of not less than three months, commencing with the convict's first arrival in the penal colony, his treatment should consist of moral, religious, and intellectual instruction, in a penitentiary. During this period, he should be secluded from all general intercourse, beyond the society of a few individuals undergoing a similar course of discipline; but access to a public hall should be allowed to him, to hear public worship and receive general instruction. By regularity of conduct and proficiency in learning, he should earn a recompense in marks, and by negligence and disobedience forfeit these. This initiatory schooling would wean him from vicious recollections, cultivate and gain his will, and enlarge his understanding, and would thus lay the foundation for subsequent moral and intellectual improvement, by continued though less exclusive care. The issue from this secluded stage of treatment should be made, in every case, to depend on proficiency. "I speak on all these points," says Captain M., "experimentally; for, however imperfect were all my proceedings in Norfolk Island, and although thwarted in every possible way, they yet left no doubt of the tendency of the principles on which they were founded."

5. After this probation, the men should be required to form themselves into parties of six, who for a time—not less than eighteen months (and longer in case they should not redeem the stated number of marks)—should be held to constitute one family, with common interests and mutually responsible; labouring, if they labour, for common benefit; and idling, if they idle, to the common injury.

By this arrangement, all interests would be engaged in the common improvement, and the better men would have a direct interest in the conduct of the worse, and therefore a right to watch, influence, and, if necessary, control them. This would create an *esprit de corps* in the whole body, directed towards good,—a matter of first-rate importance in the management of convicts.

6. When the convict had acquitted himself in a satisfactory manner, and redeemed, by his industry and good conduct, the marks allotted to these different stages, which should extend over three years at the least, he might be rewarded by a ticket of leave in the penal settlement. In this sphere, the means should be afforded him to earn a little money, as a provision for his return to society. Small farms or gardens might, with this view, be let at

moderate rents, payable in kind, to the men holding this indulgence, and the surplus produce, beyond their rents, should be purchased from them, at fair prices, into the public stores.

This mode of obtaining supplies, besides creating habits of industry and cultivating the feeling of private interest among the convicts, would tend to improve the agriculture and develop the resources of the settlement; the cost of the produce would be nearly as low as if raised directly by the Government, and much lower than if imported.

7. A fixed proportion of the prisoners (say 3, 4, or 5 per cent.), should be eligible to fill subordinate stations of trust in the general management, and receive (say) 6d per day as money salary, besides the marks attached to their situations.

The effects of this arrangement would be, to enlist a proportion of the best prisoners in the service of the establishment; to influence the conduct of the others by enabling them to look to the same advantage in their turn; and to allow of a diminution in the number of the free officers employed, and also of the military guards, who are much more expensive and less efficient instruments for controlling and directing the convict mind and labour.

8. The final liberation of the prisoners from restraint, as well as every intermediate step towards it, should in every case depend solely on having served the prescribed time, and earned the corresponding number of marks. No discretion on either head should be vested in any local authority. The whole arrangement should be, as it were, a matter of contract between each convict and the Government; and the local authorities should have no other control over it than to see its conditions, on both sides, punctually fulfilled.

On a final discharge, every facility should be afforded to the men to disperse, and enter as useful members into the free society of the colonies; but they should not be permitted to return home till the expiry of the period of banishment prescribed by their sentences.

Besides these means of improvement, Captain Macnochie proposes to employ largely secular and religious instruction, and to institute courts of justice easily and conveniently accessible to the prisoners, allowing them, at a particular part of their probation, even to act as jurors in trying delinquents, and to be eligible to serve as police or special constables. As they approach their freedom, well regulated amusements—such as music, readings, experimental and other lectures—should be open to them on suitable payment for admission. "In every way their minds should be stirred and their positions raised up to the usual privileges of freedom, before these are fully confided to them. Much may eventually depend on the transition not being at last too great."

It is only justice also to Captain M. to observe, that it is not sympathy with any mere physical suffering inflicted on the convicts by the present system that prompts him to desire reform. He states that more physical exertion is undergone, and greater privations are endured, by many an honest English labourer, than are even now imposed on the convicts by law. But the system is so contrived as to work out the perversion of all their natural feelings, and the misdirection of all their intellectual faculties; and by way of curing this moral degradation, severe punishments are resorted to. These inflictions, however, instead of removing, increase the evil. The system obviously fosters, although it does not create, the condition of mind which leads to the offences for which these punishments are inflicted; and in so far as it does so, the punishments can be viewed in no other light than as unnecessary and unprofitable, and therefore cruel. It is this whole scheme of moral

and intellectual degradation, and its attendant unnecessary and profitless suffering, that rouse Captain M.'s indignation, which, however, he never unbecomingly expresses in any of his communications.

This leads me to another remark. The admitted advantages attending scientific knowledge, compared with mere *vague and individual impressions concerning a subject*, should suggest to Captain Maconochie, and every other individual who may be charged with the execution of the new plan, the duty of applying the lights of Phrenology, as far as they will go, in all the *discretionary* parts of the treatment. By no other means can they act securely, consistently, and successfully. The cerebral development of every offender should be examined and recorded; and, where places of trust and influence are to be disposed of, the men who, by previous labour and good conduct, have earned the right to be presented to them, and who, besides, have the best moral and intellectual development of brain, should, *ceteris paribus*, be preferred. This rule will be found, in the end, to be the most humane, just, and expedient for the whole community of offenders; because the highest minds are most needed, and best calculated to do good, in such a sphere. We can easily foresee that certain individuals with large animal and intellectual, and very deficient moral organs, may, while under the ordeal of servitude, restrain their propensities, perform their prescribed tasks, and earn the necessary marks for promotion; but yet that when they are placed in a situation in which *internal self-acting morality* must supply the place of previous external restraint, they may prove wanting and inefficient. Such men, owing to their unscrupulous dispositions and powerful intellectual capacities, will be plausible, deceptive, and dangerous officers, fountains of injustice to all under their authority, constantly doing evil, yet seeming to do good, and extremely difficult to detect and expose. No arbitrary addition should be made to any man's sufferings because he has an unfortunate development of brain; but in selecting, at discretion, instruments for the moral reformation of others, we should use the most complete means in our power to ascertain the actual qualities of the instruments, and prefer those which are best suited to accomplish the end in view. Phrenology will afford valuable aid in attaining this object.

Farther,—I consider that it would be highly advantageous to the criminals themselves to teach them Phrenology as part of their moral and intellectual instruction. Many individuals of average minds, who are untrained in mental philosophy, assume their own feelings and capacities to be the types and standards of those of all other men; and why should not the lowest class do the same? In point of fact, they actually do so; and many of them believe that the portion of society which is out of prison, is, at the bottom, as unprincipled, profligate, and criminal as themselves, only more fortunate and dexterous in avoiding temptation and detection. One means of correcting these erroneous impressions, and enabling such persons to understand their own dispositions, and the real relations in which they stand to virtuous men, and also of delivering their minds from the admiration of fraud, violence, obstinate pride, and many other abuses of the propensities, which at present they regard as virtues,—would be to teach them the functions, the uses, and the abuses of every faculty, and particularly the peculiarities in their own cerebral organization, which render their perceptions unsound on certain points, and their proclivities in certain directions dangerous.

Postscript to the preceding Lecture.—Since the preceding Lecture was delivered in Edinburgh, I have

personally visited the State Prisons at Boston; at Blackwell's Island and Auburn, in the State of New York; the Eastern Penitentiary and the Moyamensing Prison of Philadelphia; and the State Prison at Weathersfield, Connecticut. I cheerfully testify to their great superiority over the vast majority of British prisons, but I am still humbly of opinion, that the discipline even in them proceeds on an imperfect knowledge of the nature of the individuals who are confined and punished in them.

In the prisons of Auburn and Sing-Sing, in the State of New York, and at Weathersfield, in the State of Connecticut, the system which has been adopted, is one combining solitary confinement at night, hard labour by day, the strict observance of silence, and attention to moral and religious improvement. At sunrise, the convicts proceed in regular order to the several work-shops, where they remain under vigilant superintendence until the hour of breakfast, when they repair to the common hall. When at their meals, the prisoners are seated at tables in single rows, with their backs towards the centre, so that there can be no interchange of signs. From one end of the work-rooms to the other, upwards of five hundred convicts may be seen, without a single individual being observed to turn his head towards a visitor. Not a whisper is heard throughout the apartments. At the close of the day, labour is suspended, and the prisoners return in military order to their solitary cells; there they have the opportunity of reading the Scriptures, and of reflecting in silence on their past lives. The chaplain occasionally visits the cells, instructing the ignorant, and administering the reproofs and consolations of religion.*

In the Eastern Penitentiary of Pennsylvania, the convict is locked up solitary in a cell during the whole period of his sentence. He is permitted to labour, and is instructed in moral and religious duties; but he is allowed to hold no converse with society, nor with the other inmates of the prison. The following remarks on these prisons are offered to your consideration:—

In order to weaken the animal propensities, it is necessary to withdraw from them every exciting influence. The discipline of the American state prisons, in which intoxicating liquors are completely excluded, in which the convicts are prevented from conversing with each other, in which each one sleeps in a separate cell, and in which regular habits and hard labour are enforced, appears to me to be well calculated to accomplish this end.

But this is only the first step in the process which must be completed, before the convict can be restored to society, with the prospect of living in it as a virtuous man. The second is, to invigorate and enlighten the moral and intellectual powers to such an extent, that he, when liberated, shall be able to restrain his own propensities, amidst the usual temptations presented by the social condition.

There is only one way of strengthening faculties, and that is by exercising them; and all the American prisons which I have seen are lamentably deficient in arrangements for exercising the moral and intellectual faculties of their inmates. During the hours of labour, no advance can be made, beyond learning a trade. This is a valuable addition to a convict's means of reformation; but it is not all-sufficient. After the hours of labour, he is locked up in solitude; and I doubt much if he can read, for want of light; but assuming that he can,—reading is a very imperfect means of strengthening the moral powers. They must be exercised, trained, and habituated to action. My humble opinion is, that in prisons there should

* Simpson on ~~Prison~~ Education, p. 274. First edition.

be a teacher, of high moral and intellectual power, for every eight or ten convicts; that after the close of labour, these instructors should commence a system of vigorous culture of the superior faculties of the prisoners, excite their moral and religious feelings, and instruct their understandings. In proportion as the prisoners give proofs of moral and intellectual advancement, they should be indulged with the liberty of social converse and action, for a certain time on each week-day, and on Sundays, in presence of the teachers, and in these *conversations*, or evening parties, they should be trained to the use of their higher powers, and habituated to restrain their propensities. Every indication of over-active propensity should be visited by a restriction of liberty and enjoyment; while these advantages, and also respectful treatment, and moral consideration, should be increased in exact proportion to the advancement of the convicts in morality and understanding. Captain Maconnochie's system of marks embraces all these advantages; and by such means, if by any, the convicts would be prepared to enter into society with a chance of resisting temptation, and continuing in the paths of virtue. In no country has the idea yet been carried into effect, that, in order to produce moral fruits, it is necessary to put into action moral influences, great and powerful in proportion to the barrenness of the soil from which they are expected to spring, and yet this is a self-evident truth.

A difference of opinion exists among intelligent persons, whether the system of solitary confinement and solitary labour, pursued in the Eastern Penitentiary of Pennsylvania, or the system followed in Auburn, of social labour in silence, enforced by inspectors, and solitary confinement after working-hours, is more conducive to the ends of criminal legislation. The principles now stated lead to the following conclusions.

Living in entire solitude weakens the whole nervous system. It withdraws external excitement from the animal propensities, but it operates in the same manner on the organs of the moral and intellectual faculties. Social life is to these powers what an open field is to the muscles; it is their theatre of action, and without action there can be no vigour. Solitude, even when combined with labour, and the use of books, and an occasional visit from a religious instructor, leaves the moral faculties still in a passive state, and without the means of vigorous active exertion. I stated to Mr Wood, the able superintendent of the Eastern Penitentiary, that, according to my view of the laws of physiology, his discipline reduced the tone of the *whole* nervous system to the level which is in harmony with solitude. The passions are weakened and subdued, but so are all the moral and intellectual powers. The susceptibility of the nervous system is increased, because all organs become susceptible of impressions, in proportion to their feebleness. A weak eye is pained by light which is agreeable to a sound one. Hence, it may be quite true, that religious admonitions will be more deeply felt by prisoners living in solitude, than by those enjoying society; just as such instruction, when addressed to a patient recovering from a severe and debilitating illness, makes a more vivid impression than when delivered to the same individual in health: but the appearances of reformation founded on such impressions are deceitful. When the sentence is expired, the convict will return to society, with all his mental powers, animal, moral, and intellectual, increased in susceptibility, but *lowered in strength*. The excitements that will then assail him, will have their influence doubled, by operating on an enfeebled frame. If he meet old associates and return to drinking and profanity, the animal propensities will be fearfully excited by the force of these temptations,

while his enfeebled moral and intellectual powers will be capable of offering scarcely any resistance. If he be placed amidst virtuous men, his higher faculties will feel acutely, but he still feeble in executing their own resolves. Mr Wood admitted that convicts, after long confinement in solitude, shudder to encounter the turmoil of the world; become excited as the day of liberation approaches, and feel bewildered when set at liberty. In short, this system is not in harmony with a sound knowledge of the physiology of the brain, although it appeared to me to be well administered.

These views are supported by the "report of Doctor James B. Coleman, physician to the New Jersey State Prison (in which solitary confinement with labour is enforced), addressed to the Board of Inspectors, November 1839." The report states, that "among the prisoners there are many who exhibit a child-like simplicity, which shews them to be less acute than when they entered. In all who have been more than a year in prison, some of these effects have been observed. Continue the confinement for a longer time, and give them no other exercise of the mental faculties than this kind of imprisonment affords, and the most accomplished rogue will lose his capacity for depredating with success upon the community. The same influence that injures the other organs will soften the brain. Withhold its proper exercise, and as surely as the bandaged limb loses its power, will the prisoner's faculties be weakened by solitary confinement." He sums up the effect of the treatment in these words, "While it subdues the evil passions, almost paralyzing them for want of exercise, it leaves the individual, if still a rogue, one who may be easily detected;" in other words, in reducing the energy of the organs of the propensities, it lowers also that of the organs of the moral and intellectual faculties, or causes the convict to approach more or less towards general idiocy. Dr Coleman does not inform us whether the brain will not recover its vigour after liberation, and thus leave the offender as great a rogue after the close, as he was at the beginning, of his confinement.

The Auburn system of social labour is better, in my opinion, than that of Pennsylvania, in so far as it allows of a little more stimulus to the social faculties, and does not weaken the nervous system to so great an extent: but it has no superiority in regard to providing efficient means for invigorating and training the moral and intellectual faculties. The Pennsylvania system preserves the convict from contamination by evil communications with his fellow prisoners, and prevents the other convicts from knowing the fact of his being in prison. It does not, however, hinder his associates who are at large from becoming aware of his conviction and imprisonment. The reports of the trial in the public newspapers inform them of these; and I was told that they will keep a note of them and watch for him on the day of his release, if they should happen themselves to be then at large, and welcome him back to profligacy and crime.

The principles of criminal legislation now advocated necessarily imply the abolition of the punishment of death.

LECTURE XV.

DUTIES OF GUARDIANS, SURETIES, JURORS, AND ARBITRATORS.

Guardianship—A duty not to be declined, though its performance is sometimes repaid with ingratitude—The misconduct is often on the part of the Guardians—Examples of both cases—

guardianship may be declined.—Duties of Guardians.—They should study and sedulously perform the obligations incumbent on them.—Property of Wards not to be misapplied to guardians' own purposes.—Co-guardians to be vigilantly watched, and checked when acting improperly.—Care for the maintenance, education, and settling out in life of the Wards.—Duty of Suretyship.—Dangers incurred by its performance.—These may be lessened by Phrenology.—Selfishness of those who decline to become sureties in any case whatever.—Precautions under which suretyship should be undertaken.—No man ought to bind himself to such an extent as to expose himself to suffer severely, or to become surety for a sanguine and prosperous individual who merely wishes to increase his prosperity.—Suretyship for good conduct.—Precautions applicable to this.—Duties of Jurors.—Few men capable of the satisfactory performance.—Suggestions for the improvement of Juries.—Duties of Arbitrators.—Erroneous notions prevalent on this subject.—Decisions of "honest men judging according to equity"—Principles of law ought not to be disregarded.

Having discussed the social duties which we owe to the poor and to criminals, I proceed to notice several duties of a more private nature, but which still are strictly social and very important. I refer to the duties of guardianship and surety.

As human life is liable to be cut short at any stage of its progress, there are always existing a considerable number of children who have been deprived, by death, of one or both of their parents; and an obligation devolves on some one or more of the members of society to discharge the duties of guardians towards them. When the children are left totally destitute, the parish is bound to maintain them; and that duty has already been considered under the head of the treatment of the poor. It is, therefore, only children who stand in need of personal guidance, or who inherit property that requires to be protected, whose case we are now to consider. We may be called on to discharge these duties, either by the ties of nature, as being the next of kin, or by being nominated guardians or trustees in a deed of settlement executed by a parent who has committed his property and family to our care.

Many persons do not regard these as moral duties, but merely as discretionary calls, which every one may discharge or decline without blame, according to his own inclination; and there are individuals who recount some half dozen of instances in which trustees and guardians, after having undergone much labour and anxiety, have been rewarded with loss, obloquy, and ingratitude; and who, on the exculpatory strength of these cases, wrap themselves up in impenetrable selfishness, and, during their whole lives, decline to undertake such duties for any human being.

It is impossible to deny, that instances of flagrant ingratitude to guardians have occurred on the part of wards; but these are exceptions to a general rule; and if the practice of declinature were to become general, young orphans would be left as aliens in society, the prey of every designing knave, or be cast on the cold affections of public officers appointed by the state to manage their affairs.

While there are examples of misconduct and ingratitude on the part of wards, there are also, unfortunately, numerous instances of malversation on the part of guardians; and those who are chargeable with this offence are too apt, when called to account, to complain of hardship, and want of just feeling on the part of their wards, as a screen to their own delinquencies. I have known some instances, indeed, but very few, in which children, whose affairs had been managed with integrity, and whose education had been superintended with kindness and discretion, have proved ungrateful; but I have known several flagrant examples of cruel mismanagement by guardians. In one instance, a common soldier who had

enlisted and gone to the Peninsular war, left two children, and property yielding about £70 a-year, under charge of a friend. He was not heard of for a considerable time, and the report became current that he had been killed. The friend put the children into the charity work-house as paupers, and appropriated the rents to his own use. A relative of the soldier, who lived at a distance, at last got tidings of the circumstance, obtained a legal appointment of himself as guardian to the children, took them out of the work-house, prosecuted the false friend, and compelled him to refund the spoils of his treachery.

In another instance, both the father and mother of two female children died, when the eldest of the children was only about three years of age. The father was survived by a brother, and also by a friend, both of whom he named as guardians. He left about £3,000 of property. The brother was just starting in business, and had the world before him. He put £1,500 of the trust-money into his own pocket, without giving any security to the children; and, during the whole of their minority, he used it as his own, and paid them neither capital nor interest. His co-trustee, who was no relation in blood, was an example of generosity as strikingly as this individual was of selfishness. He lent out the other £1,500, took the children into his house, educated them along with his own family, applied the interest of the half of their fortune which he had rescued, faithfully, for their benefit, and finally accounted to them honestly for every shilling. When the children became of age, they prosecuted their *disinterested* uncle for the portion of their funds which he had mistaken for his own; and after a considerable litigation they succeeded in recovering principal, interest, and compound interest, which the court awarded against him, in consequence of the flagrancy of the case; but they were loudly taxed by him and his family with ingratitude and want of affection, for calling to a court of law so near and dear a relative!

As a contrast to this case, I am acquainted with an instance in which a body of trustees named in a deed of settlement by a mere acquaintance, a person who had no claim on their services through relationship, managed, for many years, the funds of a young family,—superintended the education of the children,—and accounted faithfully for every farthing that came into their own possession; but who, at the close of their trust, owing to their having employed a law-agent who did not attend to his duty, and to the children having turned out immoral, were sued personally for £1,000 each, and were involved in a very troublesome and expensive litigation.

I mention these facts to convey to the younger part of my audience, who may not have had experience in such matters, an idea at once of the trouble and risks which often accompany the duty of guardianship. At the same time, I have no hesitation in saying, that I consider every man bound to undertake that duty, with all its discomforts and dangers where the dictates of the higher sentiments urge him to do so. If one of our own relatives have been laid in a premature grave, nature calls aloud on us to assist and guide his children with our experience and advice. If we have passed our lives in habits of sincere friendship, and interchange of kindness, with one not connected with us by blood, but who has been called, before the ordinary period of human life, to part from his family for ever, we are bound by all the higher and purer feelings of our nature, to lend our aid in protecting and assisting his surviving partner and children, if requested by him to do so.

There are instances, however, in which men, from their vanity or more selfish motives, do not appeal,

in their deeds of settlement, to their own respectable relatives and friends for assistance; but name men of eminent rank as the guardians of their children, under the double expectation of adding a posthumous lustre to their own names, and securing a distinguished patronage to their family. This practice is disowned by conscience, and by just feelings of independence; and trustees called on, in such circumstances, to act, are clearly entitled to decline.

Suppose, then, that a case presents itself, in which one of us feels himself justly required to accept the office of a trustee or guardian, under a deed of settlement—what is it his duty to do? Certain rules of law are laid down for the guidance of persons acting in these capacities, with which he should, at the very first, make himself acquainted. They are framed for the direction of average men, and, on the whole, prescribe a line of duty which tends essentially to protect the ward, but which also, when observed, affords an equal protection to the guardian. It has often appeared to me, from seeing the loss and suffering to which individuals are exposed from ignorance of the fundamental rules of law on this subject, that instruction in them, and in other principles of law applicable to duties which the ordinary members of society are called on to discharge, should form a branch of general education.

After having become acquainted with our duties as trustees or guardians, we should bend our minds sedulously to the upright discharge of them. We should lay down a positive resolution not to convert our wards, or their property and affairs, into sources of gain to ourselves, and not to suffer any of our co-trustees to do such an act. However tempting it may be to employ their capital in our own business, and however confident we may feel that we shall, in the end, honestly account to them for every shilling of their property,—still, I say, we ought not to yield to the temptation. The moment we do so, we commit their fortunes to all the hazards of our own; and this is a breach of trust. We place ourselves in circumstances in which, by the failure of our own schemes, we may become the instruments of robbing and ruining helpless and destitute children, committed, as the most sacred charges, to our honesty and honour. If this grand cause of malversation be avoided, there is scarcely another that may not be easily resisted.

After abstaining ourselves from misapplying the funds of our wards, our next duty is to watch over our co-trustees or guardians, in order to prevent them from falling into a similar temptation. Men of sensitive, delicate, and upright minds, who are not in the least prone to commit this offence themselves, often feel extraordinary hesitation in checking a less scrupulous co-trustee in his malpractices. They view the act as so dishonourable that they shrink from taxing another with it; and try to shut their eyes as long as possible to mismanagement, solely from aversion to give pain by bringing it to a close. But this is a weakness which is not founded in reason, but on a most erroneous view both of duty and of human nature. I can testify, from experience and observation, that a man who is thoroughly honest, never objects to have his transactions examined with the utmost strictness: He is conscious of virtue, and is pleased that his virtue should be discovered; which can never be done so effectually as by a close scrutiny of his conduct. We shall, therefore, never offend a really good and trustworthy man, by inquiring habitually how he is discharging his duty. On the contrary, he will invite us to do so; and esteem us the more, the more attentively we watch over the affairs of our pupils.

That steward whose account is clear,
Demands his honour may appear:

His actions never shun the light;
He is, and would be proved, upright.
Gay's Fables, Part II., Fab. 6.

On the other hand, if the organs of Conscientiousness be so defective in any individual, that he is tempted to misapply the funds committed to his care, he stands the more in need of being closely watched, and of having his virtue supported by checks and counsel; and in such circumstances no false delicacy should be allowed to seal our lips and tie up our hands. We cannot give just offence by the discharge of our duty in stopping speculation. If our co-guardian be upright, he will thank us for our scrupulousness; whereas, if he be dishonest, his feeling of offence will resemble that of a rogue at the officer who detects him and brings him to justice, which is unworthy of consideration.

But even in this case, we shall give much less offence than we imagine. It is a fact, of which I am convinced by extensive observation, that men in whom the organs of Conscientiousness are deficient, and who are thereby more prone to yield to temptations to infringe justice, have very little of that sensibility to the disgrace of dishonesty, which better constituted minds feel so acutely; and hence we may speak to them very plainly about their departures from duty, without their feeling debased. But whether they be offended or not, it is the duty of their co-trustees to prevent them from doing wrong.

If the funds of our pupils be properly preserved and profitably invested, there will generally be little risk of great failures in the remaining duties of trustees and guardians. These consist generally in seeing that the children are properly maintained, educated, and set out in life. Every trustee will be more able to discharge these duties well, in proportion to the range and value of his own information.

The next social duty to which I advert, is that of suretyship, or cautionry, as it is called in Scotland. A surety may either engage to pay a certain sum of money, if the principal obligant fail; or become bound for his good behaviour and proper discharge of duty, in any office to which he has been appointed. Great losses and much misery often arise from suretyship; and in consequence, many persons lay down the rule never to become surety for any human being; while others, of a more generous and confiding nature, are ready to bind themselves for almost every one who gives them a solemn assurance that they will never be called on to pay. I shall attempt to expound the philosophy of the subject, and we shall then be better able to judge of our duty.

Suretyship is a lame substitute for a knowledge of human character. There are men whose prudence and integrity are proof against every temptation; and if we were certain that any particular individual whom we designed to trust, or to employ in our affairs, was one of these, we should desire no other security for his solvency or good conduct, than that afforded by his own noble nature. But we know that there are also plausible persons who are only ostensibly honest; and we are never certain that an individual whom we are disposed to trust or employ may not, in an unlucky hour, be found to belong to this class. We, therefore, require that some one, who knows his qualities, should certify his possession of prudence and integrity, in the only way which can convince us of the entire sincerity of the recommendation, namely, by engaging to pay the debt in case of default,—or to indemnify us, if, through negligence or dishonesty, we shall suffer loss.

It appears to me that the practical application of Phrenology will diminish both the necessity for demanding security and the danger of granting it. I have repeatedly shewn to you examples of the

three classes of heads; *first*, the class very imperfectly endowed in the moral and intellectual regions; *secondly*, the class very favourably constituted, in which these have a decided preponderance; and, *thirdly*, the class in which these regions and that of the propensities stand nearly in equilibrium. No man of prudence, if he knew Phrenology, would become surety for men of the lowest class, or be accessory, in any way, to placing them in situations of trust; because this would be exposing them to temptations, which their weak moral faculties could not withstand. Men having the highest combination of organs, if well educated, might be safely trusted without security; or if we did become bound for them we should have little to fear from their misconduct. Among several thousand criminal heads which I have seen, I have never met with one possessing the highest form of combination. Only once, in a penitentiary in Dublin, I found a female whose head approached closely to this standard, and I ventured to predict that the brain was not in a healthy condition. The jailor said that he was not aware of her brain being diseased, but that she was subject to intense and long-continued headaches, during which her mental perceptions became obscure; and the physician, on hearing my remark, expressed his own matured conviction that there was diseased action in the brain. This leaves, then, only the middle class of individuals, or those in whose brains the organs of the propensities, moral sentiments, and intellect, are nearly equally balanced, as those for whose good conduct surety would be most necessary; and these are precisely the persons for whom it would be most hazardous to undertake it. The necessity and the hazard both arise from the same cause. Individuals thus constituted may be moral, as long as external temptation is withheld; but they may, at any time, lapse into dishonesty, when strong inducements to it are presented. The possession of property, committed to their charge in a confidential manner,—that is to say, in such circumstances that they may misapply it for a time without detection,—frequently operates as an irresistible temptation, and, to the consternation of their sureties, they seem to change their character, at the very moment when their good conduct was most implicitly relied on. We sometimes read in the newspapers of enormous embezzlements, or breaches of trust, or disgraceful bankruptcies, committed by persons who, during a long series of years, had enjoyed a reputable character; and the unreflecting wonder how men can change so suddenly, or how, after having known the sweets of virtue, they can be so infatuated as to part with them all, for the hollow illusions of criminal gain. But the truth is, that these men, from having the three regions of the brain nearly equally balanced, never stood at any time on a very stable basis of virtue. Their integrity, like a pyramid poised on its apex, was in danger of being overturned by every wind of temptation that might blow against it.

In judging on the subject of suretyship, it is of some importance to know the characteristic distinctions of the different classes of minds: because, in some cases, such obligations lead to no loss, while in others they are ruinous in the extreme. Our understanding is perplexed while we have no means of accounting for these differences of result; but if you will study Phrenology, and apply it practically, it will clear up many of these apparent anomalies, and enable you to judge when you are safe, and when exposed to danger.

We come now to inquire into the practical rule which we should follow, in regard to undertaking suretyship. In the present state of society, the exacting of security is in many instances indispensable; and I cannot, therefore, see any ground on

which those who decline, in all circumstances, to undertake it, can be defended. It appears to me to be a necessary duty, which presents itself to many individuals; and although, when imprudently discharged, it may be hazardous, we are not, on that account, entitled entirely to shrink from it. There are several precautions, however, which we are not only entitled, but called on, to adopt, for our own protection. In the *first* place, no man should ever bind himself to pay money to an extent, which, if exacted, would render him bankrupt; for this would be to injure his creditors by his suretyship: nay, he should not bind himself gratuitously to pay any sum for another, which, if lost, would seriously injure his own family. In short, no man is called on to undertake gratuitous and benevolent obligations beyond the extent which he can discharge without severe and permanent suffering to himself; and in subscribing such obligations, he should invariably calculate on being called on to fulfil them by payment. In general, men, even of ordinary prudence, find, by experience, that they are compelled to pay at least one-half of all the cautionary obligations which they undertake, and the imprudent even more. Unless, therefore, they are disposed to go to ruin in the career of social kindness, they should limit their obligations in proportion to their means.

Secondly—We should consider the object sought to be attained by the applicant. If he be a young man who desires to obtain employment, or to commence business on a moderate scale on his own account, or if a friend, in a temporary, unexpected, and blameless emergency need our aid, good may, in these instances, result from the act. But if the suretyship is wanted merely to enable a person who is doing well, to do, as he imagines, a great deal better; to enable him to extend his business, or to get into a more lucrative situation, we may often pause, and reasonably consider whether we are about to serve our friend, or injure both him and ourselves. According to my observation, the men who have succeeded best in the pursuits of this world, and longest and most steadily enjoyed prosperity and character, are those who, from moderate beginnings, have advanced slowly and steadily along the stream of fortune, aided chiefly by their own mental resources; men who have never hastened to be rich, but who, from the first, have seen that time, economy, and prudence, are the grand elements of ultimate success. These men ask only the means of a fair commencement, and afterwards give no trouble, either to the public or to their friends. Success flows upon them, as the natural result of their own course of action, and they never attempt to force it prematurely.

There are other individuals, full of sanguine hope, inordinate ambition, or boundless love of gain, who never discover the advantages of their present possessions, but are constantly aiming at an imaginary prosperity, just at arm's length beyond their reach; and who solicit their friends to aid them, that they may seize the prize. They urge their acquaintances to become sureties for them to raise money in order to extend their business. I recommend to those to whom this appeal is made, to moderate the pace of these sanguine speculators, instead of helping to accelerate it; to advise them to practise economy and patience, and to wait till they acquire capital of their own to increase their trade. The danger of undertaking obligations for such men arises from their over-sanguine, ambitious, and grasping dispositions, which are rendered only more ardent, by encouragement. The chances are many, that they will ruin themselves, and bring serious loss on their sureties. I have seen deplorable examples of families absolutely ruined by one of their number possessing this character. By brilliant representations of approach-

ing fortune, he succeeded in obtaining possession of the moderate patrimonies of his brothers and sisters, the funds provided for his mother's annuity; in short, the whole capital left by his father, as the fruit of a long and laborious life—and in a few years he dissipated every sixpence of it in enterprises and speculations of the most extravagant description.

One benefit of Phrenology, to those who make a practical use of it, is to enable them to discriminate between a man's hopes and his real capacities. When they see considerable deficiency in the organs of Intellect, or in those of Cautiousness, Conscientiousness, and Firmness, they know that whatever promises the individual may make, or however sincere may be his intentions of being prosperous, yet, that if he involve himself in a multitude of affairs, beyond the reach of his intellectual powers, failure will be inevitable: and they act accordingly. I have repeatedly urged individuals to abstain from assisting characters of this description to extend their speculations, and advised them to reserve their funds for emergencies of a different description, which were certain to arise; and at the distance of a few years, after the advice had been forgotten by me, they have returned and thanked me for the counsel. Such speculative men generally fall into great destitution in the end; and my recommendation to their relatives has uniformly been, to reserve their own means, with the view of saving them from abject poverty, when their schemes shall have reached their natural termination in ruin; and this has been found to be prudent advice.

As a general rule, therefore, I would dissuade you from undertaking suretyship merely to increase the quantity, or accelerate the march, of prosperity, if your friend, by the aid of time, prudence, and economy, have it in his power ultimately to command success by his own resources.

In becoming bound for the good conduct of an individual in a new employment, you should be well aware that the situation into which you are about to introduce him, is suited to his natural dispositions and capacities, and not calculated to bring the weaker elements of his character into play, and be the means of ruining him, as well as injuring yourselves. Suppose, for example, that a young man has any latent seeds of intemperance in his constitution, or that he is fond of a wandering and unsettled life, and that, by becoming surety for his faithful accounting, you should obtain employment for him as a mercantile travelling agent, you might manifestly expose him to temptations which might completely upset his virtue. I have known individuals, who, in more favourable circumstances, had acquired and maintained excellent characters, ruined by this change. Again—If an individual be either extremely good-natured, so much so that he cannot resist solicitation; or if he be ambitious and fond of display and power; or very speculative; and if you aid him in obtaining an agency for a bank, by which means he will obtain an immediate command of large sums of money, you may bring him to ruin, when you intended to do him a great service; for his integrity will thereby be exposed to assaults in all these directions. It has been remarked, that more men prove unsuccessful as bank-agents, than almost in any other office of trust; and the reason appears to me to be, that the free command of money presents greater temptations to the weak points of character than almost any other external circumstance. For this reason, it is only men of the highest natural moral qualities who should be appointed to such situations: individuals whose integrity and love of justice and duty are paramount, to all their other feelings; and then, with average intellectual endowments, their conduct will be irreproachable. It is clear, that until we possess an

index to natural talents and dispositions which can be relied on in practice, much disappointment, loss, and misery, must inevitably be sustained, by the improper location or employment of individuals in the complicated relations of society; and if Phrenology promise to aid us in arriving at this object, it is worthy of our most serious consideration.*

Another social duty which men are occasionally called on to discharge, is that of acting privately as *arbitrators* between disputing parties, or publicly as *jurymen*. According to the present practice, no special preparation for these duties is supposed to be necessary. A young man may have obtained any kind of education, or no education; he may possess any degree of intelligence and talent; and he may be upright in his dispositions, or very much the reverse; yet none of these things are of the least consideration, in regard to his qualification to serve as a juror. As soon as he is found inhabiting a house, or possessing a shop, or a farm, of a certain rent, his name is placed on the list of jurors; he is summoned in his turn to sit on the bench of justice, and there he disposes, by his vote, of the lives and fortunes of his fellow-men. The defence maintained for this system is, that as twelve individuals are selected in civil cases, and fifteen in criminal, the verdict will embody the average intelligence and morality of the whole; and that, as the roll of jurors includes all the higher and middle ranks, their decisions, if not absolutely perfect, will, at least, be the best that can be obtained. This apology is, to some extent, well-founded; and the superior intelligence of a few frequently guides a vast amount of ignorance and dullness in a jury. Still, the extent of this ignorance and inaptitude is a great evil; and as it is susceptible of removal, it should not be permitted to exist.

All of you who have served as jurors, must be aware of the great disadvantages under which individuals labour in that situation, from want of original education, as well as of habits of mental application. I knew an instance in which a jury, in a civil cause which embraced a long series of mercantile transactions, including purchases, sales, bills, excise entries, permits, and other technical formalities, was composed of four Edinburgh traders, and of eight men balloted from the county of Edinburgh, where it borders on Lanarkshire and Peeblesshire, men who occupied small farms, who held the plough and drove their own carts; persons of undoubted respectability and intelligence in their own sphere, but who knew nothing of mercantile affairs; whose education and habits rendered them totally incapable of taking notes of evidence, and, of course, of forming any judgment for themselves. When the jury retired at ten o'clock at night, after a trial of twelve hours, one of the merchants was chosen foreman, and he asked the opinion of his brethren in succession. Eight of them echoed the charge of the presiding judge; but the other three announced a contrary opinion. The jurors from the country, seeing that the merchants were all on one side, and they on the other, acknowledged that the details of the case had extended far beyond their capacity of comprehension; that they really could form no judgment on the question, and therefore concluded that it was safest to follow the judge. The minority, who understood the case thoroughly, differed from the

* Several joint-stock companies have recently been formed to guarantee the intromissions and good conduct of persons employed in situations of trust, and the moderate premiums which they demand speak highly for the general integrity of the industrious classes of Great Britain. In the *Phrenological Journal*, vol. xiv., p. 237, some remarks will be found on the use which may be made of Phrenology by these associations.

judge; they took great pains to explain, from their own notes, the leading circumstances to the majority, and succeeded in bringing them over to their opinion; and the result was, a verdict of a totally opposite description to that at first proposed. I obtained this information the day after the trial, from one of those who had stood in the minority. The verdict was right, and no attempt was made to disturb it by the party who lost his cause.

The majority were not to blame; they had been called on to discharge a public duty for which they were totally unprepared, and they did their best to accomplish the ends of justice. But what I humbly submit to your consideration, is, that, as the ordinary members of the community are called on to exercise the very important office of jurors, and may become the instruments of taking away the life or property of their fellow-men, their education should be so conducted as to qualify them to a reasonable extent for discharging so grave a duty. If we were accustomed to look on our social duties as equally important with our private interest, instruction calculated to qualify us to comprehend questions of private right and public criminality would undoubtedly form a branch of our early instruction. It might be useful to confer certificates or civil degrees on young men, founded on an examination into their educational attainments, and to render these indispensable by law to their being placed on the roll of jurors, or even of voters, and also to their exercising any public office of trust, honour, or emolument. The effects of such a regulation would probably be, that it would be considered disgraceful to want this qualification; that parents would strain every nerve to obtain it for their children; and that all who required to be the architects of their own fortunes, would pursue such studies as would enable them to acquire it. In Scotland the standard of education is low, but in England it is still humbler. I knew an Englishman who had acquired a fortune exceeding £70,000, whose whole educational acquirements consisted in reading and the ability to subscribe his own name. He was, as you may suppose, a man of great natural talent. A clerk always accompanied him in his mercantile journeys, who conducted his correspondence, drew his bills, kept his books, and, as far as possible, supplied his want of original education; but he strongly felt the extent of his own defects. His affairs had required such constant active exertion, after he had entered into business, that he had found no leisure to educate himself; and he was so far advanced in life when I conversed with him, that he had then no hopes of going to school.

Analogue to the duty of jurors, is that of acting as arbitrator between individuals who have differences with each other which they cannot amicably adjust. This being altogether a voluntary duty, it may be supposed that those only who are well known to be qualified for it, will be called on to discharge it; but the reverse is too often the case. Individuals who are themselves ignorant of the nature of an arbitrator's duties, are no judges of what qualifies another person to discharge them, and often make most preposterous selections. It is indeed a very common opinion, that the referee is the advocate of the party who nominates him, and that his duty consists in getting as many advantages for his friend as possible. Hence, in anticipation of disagreement, power is generally given to the two referees, in case of difference in opinion, to choose a third person, whose award shall be final; and not unfrequently this *overman*, as he is called in Scotland, halves the differences between the two discordant arbitrators, and assumes that this must be absolute justice.

It is a favourite maxim with persons not conversant with law, that all disputes are best settled by

a reference to "honest men judging according to equity." I have never been blind to the imperfections of law and of legal decisions; but I must be permitted to say, that I have seen the worst of them far surpassed in absurdity and error, by the decisions of honest men judging according to equity. If any of you have ever acted as an arbitrator, he must have found that the first difficulty that presented itself to his understanding, was the wide difference between the contending parties regarding matters of fact. The law solves this difficulty, by requiring evidence, and by establishing rules for determining what evidence shall be sufficient. Honest men, in general, hold themselves to be quite capable of discovering, by the inherent sagacity of their own minds, which statement is true, and which false, without any evidence whatever, or, at least by the aid of a very lame probation. The next difficulty which an arbitrator experiences is, to discover a principle in reason, by which to regulate his judgment, so that impartial men may be capable of perceiving why he decides as he does, and that the parties themselves may be convinced that justice has been done to them. In courts of law, certain rules, which have been derived from a comprehensive survey of human affairs, and much experience, are taken as the guides of the understanding in such circumstances. These are called rules or principles of law. They do not always possess the characteristics of wisdom which I have here described, nor are they always successfully applied; but the objects aimed at, both in framing and applying them, are unquestionably truth and justice. Yet honest men, judging according to equity, too frequently treat all such rules with contempt, assume their own feelings to be better guides, and conceive that they have dispensed absolute justice, when they have followed the dictates of their own understandings, unenlightened, inexperienced, and sometimes swayed by many prejudices.

I recollect a decision of this kind, which astonished both parties. A trader in Edinburgh had ordered a cargo of goods from Liverpool, according to a description clearly given in a letter. They were sent, and invoiced according to the description. When they arrived, it was discovered that they were greatly inferior, and even some of the articles different in kind from those ordered; and also that they were faded, and on the point of perishing through decay. The purchaser refused to receive them; the seller insisted; and the question was referred to an "honest man." He decided that the goods were not conformable to the order given, and that the purchaser was not bound to receive them; but he nevertheless condemned the purchaser to pay the freight from Liverpool, and all the expenses of the arbitration; and assigned as his reasons for doing so, that he, the arbitrator, was not bound by rules of law, but was entitled to act according to equity; that the seller would sustain an enormous loss, by disposing of the cargo at Leith for what it would bring; that the purchaser had escaped a serious evil, in being allowed to reject it; and that, therefore, it was very equitable that the purchaser should bear a little of the seller's burden; and in his opinion the freight and costs would form a very moderate portion of the total loss which would be sustained. He added, that it would teach the purchaser not to order whole cargoes again, which he thought was going beyond the proper limits of his trade; besides, it was a very dangerous thing for any man to order a whole cargo, especially when he had not seen the goods before they were shipped.

Perhaps some persons may be found, to whom this may appear to be a just judgment; but to every one acquainted with the principles of trade, and who perceives that the seller's bad faith, or unbusinesslike error, was the sole cause of the evil, it must ap-

pear, at best, as a well intended absurdity, if not a downright iniquity.

I know another case, in which the arbitrator found himself much puzzled, and resorted to this method of solving the difficulty: He called the two parties, Mr A and Mr B, to meet him in a tavern, and placed them in separate rooms. He went first to Mr A, and told him that he had seriously read all the papers, and considered the case, and had come to the conclusion that he, Mr A, was entirely in the wrong, and that he meant to decide against him, but had called him and Mr B to meet him, to try if it were possible to negotiate a compromise between them, to save himself from the disagreeable necessity of pronouncing such a decision. He concluded by asking Mr A what was the largest sum he would voluntarily offer, to avoid the impending decision. Mr A, after expressing his surprise and disappointment, and arguing his case anew, which argument was heard patiently, and pronounced to be unsatisfactory, at last named a sum. The arbitrator proceeded to the room in which Mr B was waiting, and told him that he had studied the case, &c., and was extremely sorry that he regarded him as completely in the wrong, and meant to decide against him; but as he had a regard for him, he begged to know the smallest sum which he was willing to accept, if Mr A could be induced to offer it, as an amicable compromise, to save him the pain of pronouncing such a judgment. Mr B argued, and was listened to; his arguments were repelled, and he was again solicited to name a sum, under pain of having a decision immediately pronounced, which would deprive him of all. He at last named a sum. There was a wide difference between the sums named; but the referee was not to be defeated; he went backward and forward between them, constantly threatening each in turn with his adverse decision, till he forced the one up and beat the other down, so that they at last met; and then, keeping them still apart, he caused each of them to subscribe a binding letter of compromise. This accomplished, he introduced them to each other, and boasted of the equity of his mode of settling the dispute.

This decision was more disinterested than one of a similar kind mentioned by Cicero. An arbiter, Quintus Fabius Labeo, being appointed by the Senate of Rome to settle a boundary between the people of Nola and those of Naples, counselled each to avoid greediness, and rather to restrict than unjustly to extend their claims. They both acted on this advice, and a space of unclaimed ground was left in the middle. He gave to each the boundary which they had claimed, and the middle space to the Roman people!

LECTURE XVI.

GOVERNMENT.

Various theories of the origin of government—Theory derived from Phrenology—Circumstances which modify the character of a government—Government is the power and authority of a nation, delegated to one or a few of its members for the general good—General consent of the people its only moral foundation—Absurdity of doctrine of the Divine right of governors—Individuals not entitled to resist the government whenever its acts are disapproved by them—Rational mode of reforming a government—Political improvement slow and gradual—Advantages thence resulting—Independence and liberty of a nation distinguished—French government before and after the Revolution—British government—Relations of different kinds of government to the human faculties—Conditions necessary for national independence; (1.) Adequate size of brain; (2.) Intelligence and love of country sufficient to enable the people to act in concert,

and sacrifice private to public advantage.—National liberty—High moral and intellectual qualities necessary for its attainment—Illustrations of the foregoing principles from history—Republics of North and South America contrasted—The Swiss and Dutch—Failure of the attempt to introduce a free constitution into Sicily.

Various opinions have been entertained by philosophers regarding the origin of government. Some have viewed it as an extension of the parental authority instituted by Nature; others as founded on a compact, by which the subjects surrendered part of their natural liberty to their rulers, and obtained in return protection, and the administration of just laws for the public benefit. Some have assigned to it a Divine origin, and held that kings and rulers, of every rank, are the delegates of heaven, and have a title to exercise dominion altogether independently of the will of their subjects. None of these views appear to me to reach the truth.

In the human mind, as disclosed to us by Phrenology, we find social instincts, the activity of which leads men to congregate in society. We observe that they differ in natural force of character, intellectual talent, and bodily strength, whence some are powerful and some weak. We discover, also, organs of Veneration, giving the tendency to look up with respect to superior power, to bow before it, and to obey it. There are also organs of Self-Esteem, prompting men to assume authority, to wield it, and to exact obedience. Government seems to me to spring from the spontaneous activity of these faculties, combined with intellect, without any special design or agreement on the part either of governors or of subjects. In rude ages, individuals possessing large brains (which give force of character), active temperaments, and large organs of Self-Esteem and Love of Approbation, would naturally assume superiority, and command. Men with smaller brains, less mental energy, and considerable Veneration, would as instinctively obey; and hence government would begin.

This is still seen among children; for in their enterprises they follow and obey certain individuals as leaders, who possess such qualifications as those now enumerated. A good illustration of this occurs in the autobiography of Benjamin Franklin. The force of character, and fertility in expedients, arising from his large and active brain, made him a ruler in childhood as well as in mature age. "Residing near the water," says he, "I was much in it and on it. I learned to swim well, and to manage boats; and when embarked with other boys, I was commonly allowed to govern, especially in any case of difficulty; and upon other occasions I was generally the leader of the boys."

In proportion as the moral and intellectual faculties develop themselves in a tribe or nation, there is a tendency to define and set limits to the power of the rulers, and to ascertain and enlarge the boundaries of the liberties of the subjects. External circumstances also modify the character of the government. If surrounded by powerful and ambitious neighbours, the subjects of a particular state forego many individual advantages, for the sake of the higher security which they derive from placing the whole power of the nation in the hands of a single individual. They prefer a despotism, because it enables the executive government to concentrate and propel the whole physical force of the kingdom against an invading enemy. In other circumstances, where local situations, such as those of England, or the United States of North America, expose the national independence to few dangers, the subjects, in proportion to their moral and intellectual advancement, naturally limit the power of their sovereigns or rulers.

I regard the form of government of any particular country to have arisen from the following causes, or some combination of them :—

First—The size and particular combination of the organs in the brains of the people.

Secondly—The temperament of the people.

Thirdly—The soil and climate of the nation.

Fourthly—The character and condition of the nations with whom they are geographically in contact.

And,

Lastly—The extent of moral and intellectual cultivation which the people have undergone.

Rationally viewed, government is the just exercise, by one or a few individuals, of the power and authority of the nation, delegated to them for the general good; and the only moral foundation of it is the general consent of the people. There may be conquest, and masters and slaves; but this form of government is the result of force triumphing over right; and one duty incumbent on the people in such a state of things, is to overthrow the victor's dominion as speedily as possible. It is an error to suppose that nature requires us when we enter into the social state to abandon or limit our rights as individuals. Man is by nature a social being, and ample gratification of all his faculties, within the limits of morality and health, is compatible with his existence in that condition. "Man has a right," says Mr Hurlbut,* "to the gratification, indulgence, and exercise of every innate power and faculty of his mind. The exercise of a faculty is its only use. The manner of its exercise is one thing, that involves a question of morals. The right to its exercise is another thing, in which no question is involved, but the existence of the innate faculty, and the objects presented by nature for its gratification," p. 13. Rulers and subjects are all equally men, and equally placed under the Divine laws; and as these proclaim the obligation on each of us to do to others as we would have them to do unto us, and to love our neighbours as ourselves, the notion of *right* in any one man or class of men to rule, for their own pleasure or advantage, over their neighbours, against their inclination and inconsistently with their welfare, is utterly excluded. The only government which the moral and intellectual faculties can recognise as founded in nature, is that which flows from, and is exercised directly for the benefit of, the subjects. The doctrine that kings, princes, and nobles, have rights of property in the homage, services, and devotion of other men, which they are entitled to exact for their own benefit and gratification, whether agreeable to the will of the subjects or not, flows from egotism unregulated by reason and justice. It is an example of the selfish system carried to infatuation, in which princely rights become an overwhelming idea, and obliterate from the mind the perceptions of all moral and intellectual distinctions inconsistent with themselves. The Bourbons pretended to have Divine right of this kind to govern France; and when Louis XVIII. was restored by the victorious arms of the sovereigns of Europe, he, out of his mere grace, issued a charter, conferring a certain extent of freedom on the French nation. After the revolution of July 1830, when Charles X. was driven from the throne, the French abjured the principle, and, to prevent its recurrence, insisted that Louis Philippe should be styled the king, not of France, but of the *French*; that is, chosen by the French people to rule over them.

The idea that government is instituted and maintained exclusively for the welfare of the people, does

not, however, imply that each individual is authorized to resist it, whenever he conceives that it is injurious to his particular interests, or disagreeable to his taste. The social law of our nature, out of which government springs, binds us together for good and also for evil. I have endeavoured to shew that we cannot attain to the full gratification of our own desires, even although enlightened and reasonable, until we have persuaded our neighbours to adopt the same social movements with ourselves. If we attempt to advance alone, even to good, we shall find ourselves situated like a soldier on a march, who should move faster or slower than his column. He would be instantly jostled out of the ranks and compelled to walk by himself. The same result occurs in regard to individual attempts to arrest or improve a government. The first step, in a rational and moral course of action, is to convince our fellow-men of the existence of the evils which we wish to have removed, and to engage their co-operation in the work; and until this be done, to continue to obey. As soon as the evil is generally perceived, and a desire for its removal pervades the public mind, the amendment becomes easy of accomplishment. By the social law, individuals who attempt changes, however beneficial, on public institutions, without this preparation of the general mind, encounter all the hazards of being swept into perdition by the mere force of ancient prejudices and superstitions, even although these may have their roots entirely in ignorance, and may be disavowed by reason. The principles of Phrenology are excellent guides; they teach us that the propensities and sentiments are mere blind instincts, and that they often cling to objects to which they have been long devoted, independently of reason. They shew us that when we desire to change their direction, we must do much more than simply convince the understanding. We must, by quiet and gradual efforts, loosen the attachment of the feelings to the injurious objects, and, by soothing and persuasion, incline them to the new and better principles which we desire them to embrace.

There is the soundest wisdom in this arrangement of Providence, by which political improvement is slow and gradual; because, in the very nature of things, pure moral institutions cannot flourish and produce their legitimate fruits, unless the people for whom they are intended possess corresponding moral and intellectual qualities. This fact will become abundantly evident, when we trace the progress of government more in detail.

The first requisite towards the formation of a government by a nation, is, that it be *independent* of foreign powers. If it do not possess independence, the people must of necessity submit to the will of their foreign master, who generally rules them according to narrow views of his own advantage, without the least regard to their feelings or welfare.

Great confusion prevails in the minds of many persons regarding the words *liberty* and *independence*, when applied to nations. A nation is *independent* when it does not owe submission to any foreign power. Thus, France and Spain, under the Bourbon dynasties, before the French revolution, were both independent; they owned no superior: But they were not free; the people did not enjoy liberty: that is to say, their internal government was despotic; the personal liberty, lives, and fortunes of the subjects were placed at the uncontrolled disposal of the sovereign. No foreign potentate could oppress a Frenchman with impunity, because the offender would have been chastised by the French Government, which was independent and powerful, and made it a point of honour to protect its subjects from foreign aggression—for permitting this would

* Essays on "Human Rights, and their Political Guaranties, by E. P. Hurlbut, Counsellor at Law in the city of New York" 1845. These essays are written on the principles of Phrenology, and constitute a profound, lucid, and philosophical treatise on the subject of Human Rights.

have implied its own imbecility or dependence. But a Frenchman enjoyed no protection from the arbitrary and unjust acts of his own government at home. The kings were in the practice of issuing "Lettres de cachet," or warrants for the secret imprisonment of any individual, for an indefinite period, without trial, without even specifying his offence, and without allowing him to communicate with any power or person, for his protection or vindication. There was no restraint against the murder of the victim, when so imprisoned; and life was as insecure as liberty.

Under that sway, the French nation was independent, but the people were not free. They are now both independent and free; for no foreign nation rules over them, and they, as individuals, are protected by the law from all arbitrary interference with their private rights by their own government. The inhabitants of Britain have long enjoyed both advantages.

England has been independent almost since the Romans left the country; for although it was conquered by the Normans, in the year 1066, the conquerors fixed their residence in the vanquished territory, made it their home, and in a few generations were amalgamated with the native population. But England was not properly free till after the revolution in 1688. The Scottish and Irish nations now form, along with England, one empire which is independent, and all the people of which are free. That is, the nation owns no superior on earth, and every individual is protected by the laws, in his person, his property, and privileges, not only against the aggressions of his neighbours, but against the government itself. The only obligation incumbent on the subject towards the state is to obey the laws; and when he has done so, the rulers have no power over him whatever for evil.

The history of the world shows that some nations have habitually under subjection to foreign powers; that other nations are independent, but not free; while a few, a very few indeed, enjoy at once the blessings of independence and liberty. It may be advantageous to investigate the causes of these different phenomena.

The social duties which we owe to our rulers are extremely important; yet we cannot comprehend them aright, without understanding thoroughly the subject of government itself, and the relations of the different kinds of it to the human faculties. On this account, the brief exposition which I propose to give of this subject, is not foreign to the grand question of our moral duty.

To secure and maintain national independence, the first requisite in the people appears to be adequate size of brain. You are well acquainted with the phrenological principle, that size of brain, other conditions being equal, is the measure of mental power. Now, all experience shews, that wherever a people possessing small brains have been invaded by one possessing large brains they have fallen prostrate before them. The Peruvians, Mexicans, and Hindoos, have uniformly been deprived of their independence when invaded by European nations, whose brains are larger. On the contrary, wherever the invaded people have possessed brains larger, or as large, as those of their assailants, and also the second requisite for independence, which I shall immediately mention, they have successfully resisted. The Caribs, Araucanians, Caffres, and others, are examples of barbarian tribes, with brains of a full size, successfully resisting the efforts of Europeans to enslave them.*

The advantages of national independence are invaluable, and these examples should operate as strong motives to the observance of the organic laws, in order to prevent deterioration and diminution of the brain in a nation, and to avoid mental imbecility, which is their invariable accompaniment. In Spain, the aristocratic class had long infringed these laws, and in the beginning of the present century her king and nobles were sunk into such effeminacy, that they became the easy prey of the men of energetic brains who then swayed the destinies of France. It was only when the great body of the people, who were not so corrupted and debased, put forth their energies to recover their independence, that, with the aid of Britain, the foreign yoke was broken.

The second requisite to independence is, that the people shall possess so much intelligence and love of their country, as to be capable of acting in concert, and of sacrificing, when necessary, their individual interests to the public welfare. You can easily understand, that, however energetic the individuals of a nation may be, if they should be so deficient in intelligence as to be incapable of joining in a general plan of defence, they must necessarily fall before a body of invaders who obey a skilful leader, and act in combination. This was the case with the Caribs. Their brains, particularly in the regions of Combativeness and Destructiveness, were so large, that, individually, they possessed great energy and courage, and could not be subdued; but their reflecting organs were so deficient that they were incapable of co-operating in a general system of defence. The consequence was, that, as individuals, they resisted to the last extremity, and were exterminated, although never subdued. The Araucanians possessed equally large organs of the propensities, but greatly larger intellectual organs. They were capable of combination; they acted in concert, and preserved their independence. The natives of New Zealand appear to belong to the same class; and if they are extirpated it must be on account of the smallness of their numbers.

When a nation is assailed by external violence, the great body of the people must be prepared also to sacrifice their individual interests at the shrine of

George Lyon of Edinburgh, in several able Essays published in the second and third volumes of the *Phrenological Journal* in 1825 and 1826. The evidence of the soundness of the principles then advanced, afforded by the specimens of the skulls of nations and tribes which have been conquered by European invaders, as well as those of tribes which have successfully resisted these invaders, contained in the collection of the Phrenological Society at Edinburgh, is very striking. It has received a great accession of strength from the work of Dr Morton of Philadelphia, on the "*Crania Americana*." Dr Pritchard, in the Natural History Section of the British Association, at a meeting held on the 29th August 1839, brought forward a paper on the extermination of various uncivilized races of mankind, and recommended a grant of money for assisting his investigations into their habits and history. He proceeded, apparently without having read the writings of phrenologists on the subject, and certainly without having examined the evidence on it contained in the Phrenological Society's Museum. Indeed, in answer to a question from Mr H. C. Watson, he confessed that he had not examined the skulls in the Museum. Dr Pritchard is a man of talents, and indeed he had need to be so, when he undertakes to elucidate the natural history of man, with a determined resolution to shut his eyes against the most important discovery that has ever been made in this branch of science. Nor does he stand alone in this determination. In 1834, when the British Association met in Edinburgh, being a member of the Association, I wrote a letter, offering to give a demonstration of the national skulls in the Phrenological Society's Museum, before any of the sections in which such a communication could be received; but the Secretaries did not even answer my letter!

* The first phrenological elucidation of the causes of the INDEPENDENCE and LIBERTY of nations was given by Mr

their country before independence can be maintained. The connection between national independence and individual welfare is so palpable and so speedily felt, that a small portion of moral sentiment suffices to render men capable of this devotion. Indeed, if Combativeness and Destructiveness, which delight in war,—and Self-Esteem, which hates obedience, be strong, these, combined with intellect, are sufficient to secure independence. It is only when indolence and avarice have become the predominant feelings of the people, combined with a want of vigour in Self-Esteem, and Combativeness, that they prefer their individual comforts and property, even under the galling yoke of a foreign foe, to national independence.

These facts in the natural history of nations were unknown until Phrenology brought them to light. Formerly, all differences between different tribes of people were accounted for by differences of climate, education, and institutions; but we now see that development of brain is fundamental, and is one chief cause of the differences of national institutions. Climate certainly operates on the mind, but it does so only through the nerves and brain: and hence, a knowledge of the influence of the brain on the mind, and on the institutions which flow from it, is the basis of a sound philosophy respecting the independence of nations.

The last and best condition of a nation is when it is not only independent, but free; that is, when it owns no foreign master, and when each inhabitant acknowledges no master at home, except the laws, and magistrates, who are their interpreters and administrators.

Before a people can attain to this form of government, they must possess not only the qualities requisite for independence, but far higher moral and intellectual gifts than mere independence demands. The love of justice must have become so prevalent, that no limited number of individuals can muster followers sufficient to place themselves in the condition of masters over the rest. The community in general must be enlightened to such a degree, that they will perceive the inevitable tendency of individuals to abuse power when they possess it without control; and they must have so much of devotion to the general interests as to feel disposed, by a general movement, to oppose and put an end to all attempts at acquiring such dominion; otherwise the nation cannot enjoy liberty. They must, also, as individuals, be, in general, moderate, virtuous, and just, in their own ambition; ready to yield to others all the political enjoyments and advantages which they claim for themselves.

History confirms these principles. The original European settlers of North America were English families, who had left their country under religious or political persecution; and their numbers were recruited by industrious persons, who emigrated to that land with a view to improving their condition by the exercise of their industry and talents. When they threw off the yoke of Britain, they were a moral and an intelligent people;—they instituted the American republic, the freest government on earth, and which has flourished in vigour to the present day.

The continent of South America was peopled at first by ruffian warriors and avaricious adventurers, who waded through oceans of blood to dominion over the natives, and who practised cruelty, oppression, and spoliation, but not industry, as their means of acquiring wealth. Their numbers were maintained by a succession of men animated by the same motives, and possessing essentially the same characteristics, sent out by the corrupted government of old Spain, to a harvest of spoil. They were not the amiable, the religious, and the laborious sons of the

Spanish soil, driven away by oppression, hating injustice, and flying to a new country for refuge from tyranny, as was the case in North America. In the beginning of the present century the troubles of Spain tempted these South American colonists to disclaim her authority; and they waged, for their independence, a long and a bloody war; in which they were at last successful. In imitation of the North Americans, they then formed themselves into republics, and instituted government by laws.

But mark the result. The cruel, base, self-seeking, dishonest, vain, and ambitious propensities, which had distinguished them as Spanish colonists, did not instantly leave them, when they proclaimed themselves to be free citizens of independent republics. On the contrary, these feelings which had characterized them from the first, continued to operate with fearful energy. As private individuals, the new republicans devoted themselves to evading payment of all government taxes; the duties exacted on imported commodities were pocketed by the functionaries entrusted with their collection, or converted into the means of oppressing rival politicians and traders. Their public couriers were robbed. In their Senates, they formed themselves into cabals for the promotions of projects of local advantage or individual ambition; and when not successful, they obstructed all measures for the general advantage, or appealed to arms to obtain their objects. The consequence has been, that, owing solely to the ignorance, the selfishness, and the absence of general morality and love of justice in the people, these states, with the richest soils and finest climates in the world, with independence, and with the most improved forms of domestic government, have, since they acquired their liberty, exhibited almost one unvaried scene of revolution, bloodshed, and contention. This is the penalty which Providence ordains them to pay for their parents' transgressions, and for the immoral dispositions which they have inherited from them.

As a contrast to these events, the history of the Swiss and the Dutch may be alluded to. Both of these people have large brains, and considerable development of both the moral and intellectual organs. The Swiss were early distinguished by the simplicity of their manners, and their moral devotion and determination; while Holland was peopled from various countries by individuals flying, like the British Americans, from civil or religious persecution. The Swiss had been free from time immemorial, although their independence dates from 1308.

"Till the reign of Albert I," says Mr G. Lyon,* "the Emperors of Germany had respected the rights and privileges of the Swiss. Rodolph, in particular, the father of Albert, had always treated them with great indulgence, and had generously assisted them in defending their liberties against the noblemen who attempted to infringe them. But Albert aimed to govern the Swiss as an absolute sovereign, and had formed a scheme for erecting their country into a principality for one of his sons. Having failed in his attempts to induce them to submit voluntarily to his dominion, he resolved to tame them by rougher methods, and appointed governors, who domineered over them in the most arbitrary manner. 'The tyranny of these governors,' says Russell, 'exceeded all belief; but I need not repeat the story of the governor of Uri, who ordered his hat to be fixed upon a pole in the market-place, to which every passenger was commanded to pay obeisance on pain of death; or the sequel of that story, in which the illustrious William Tell nobly dared to disobey this imperious command. This example determined

* Phrenological Journal, vol. iii., p. 247.

Melchthal of Unterwalden, Straffacher of Schweitz, and Furtz of Uri, to put in execution the measures they had concerted for the delivery of their country. And here we perceive the power of combination which a people possesses who act under the influence of the higher sentiments. The whole inhabitants of the several cantons, we are told, were secretly prepared for a general revolt, and the design, which was resolved upon on the 17th September 1307, was executed on the 1st of January 1308. 'On that day,' says Coxe, 'the whole people rose as with one accord, to defy the power of the house of Austria, and of the head of the empire. They surprised and seized the Austrian governors, and, with a moderation unexampled in the history of the world, they conducted them to the frontiers, obliged them to promise on oath never more to serve against the Helvetic nation, peaceably dismissed them, and thus accomplished their important enterprise, without the loss of a single life.'

The Austrians soon invaded the country in great force, and the people were called on to sacrifice life and property in defence of their liberties. "Never did any people," observes Russell, "fight with greater spirit for their liberty, than the Swiss. They purchased it by above fifty battles against the Austrians, and they well deserved the prize for which they fought; for never were the beneficial effects of liberty more remarkable than in Switzerland." "In the mean time," continues Mr Lyon, "I shall confine myself to a few insulated traits of character, indicating, in an eminent degree, the possession of the higher sentiments, which we have all along predicated to be necessary to the acquisition and enjoyment of freedom. The first that I shall notice is their conduct in regard to the assassins of Albert, the great enemy of their liberties, who, at the very moment when he was on his march to invade the country with a powerful force, was assassinated by his nephew, with the assistance of four confidential adherents. After the deed was committed, they escaped into the cantons of Uri, Schweitz, and Unterwalden, not unnaturally expecting to find an asylum among a people whom Albert was preparing unjustly to invade; 'but the generous natives,' says Coxe, 'detesting so atrocious a deed, though committed on their inveterate enemy, refused to protect the murderers,' who all subsequently suffered the punishment due to their crime."

The celebrated battle of Morgarten, in which, for the first time, the Swiss encountered and defeated the whole force of Austria, affords another striking example of the manner in which self-devotion contributes to the establishment of independence. "Leopold assembled 20,000 men, to trample, as he said, the audacious rustics under his feet; but the Swiss beheld the gathering storm without dismay. To meet it, and to dispute it 1400 men, the flower of their youth, grasped their arms and assembled at the town of Schweitz. Veneration and all the higher sentiments were manifested, when they proclaimed a solemn fast, passed the day in religious exercises and chanting hymns, and, kneeling down in the open air, implored 'the God of heaven and earth to listen to their lowly prayers, and humble the pride of their enemies. They took post on the heights of Morgarten, and waited the approach of the enemy. If ever there were circumstances in which they might have relaxed their rigid virtue, it was at the time when their liberties and their very existence were at stake; but even at this moment they disdained to recruit their ranks from those whose lives had been sullied by the violation of the laws. The petition of fifty outlaws, that they might be permitted to share the dangers of the day with their countrymen, was, therefore, unhesitatingly rejected. The victory was com-

plete. Besides those who fell in the battle, not less than fifteen hundred, most of whom were nobles or knights, were slain in the rout; and Leopold himself with difficulty escaped under the guidance of a peasant to Winterthur, where he arrived in the evening, gloomy, exhausted, and dismayed. A solemn fast was decreed to be held, in commemoration of the day, 'in which the God of hosts had visited his people, and given them the victory over their enemies;' and the names and heroic deeds of those champions who had fallen in defence of their country, were ordered to be annually recited to the people."

The history of the Dutch is somewhat similar, although not so full of noble generosity. They resisted by force of arms, and at the expense of the greatest sufferings and sacrifices, the tyranny of Spain, for the sake of liberty of conscience; and at last established at once their independence and freedom: and both they and the Swiss continue to enjoy these advantages to the present day. How unlike was the individual character of the British Americans, the Swiss, and the Dutch, to that of the Spanish Americans; and how different the uses which they have made of their independence when obtained! The last illustration with which I shall trouble you, in proof that freedom cannot exist without intelligence and morality in the people, is afforded by Sicily.

"It is well known," says Mr Lyon,* "that, during the course of the late war, the island of Sicily was taken possession of by Great Britain; and, with a magnanimity peculiarly her own, she resolved to bestow on her new ally that form of government, and those laws, under which she herself had attained to such a pitch of prosperity and glory. Whether the zeal thus manifested to the Sicilians was a zeal according to knowledge, will immediately appear; but there can be no doubt that the gift was generously, freely, and honestly bestowed. The Sicilian government was, therefore, formed exactly after the model of the British. The legislative, executive, and judicial powers were separated; vesting the first in a parliament composed of lords and commons; the second in the king and his ministers; the last in independent judges. Due limits were set to the prerogative, by not permitting the sovereign to take cognizance of bills in progress, or to interfere in any way with the freedom of debate, or the purity of election; the peerage was rendered respectable by making titles unalienable and strictly hereditary, and by forbidding the elevation to the peerage of such as were not already in possession of a fief to which a title had belonged, and whose annual income was not 6000 ounces of silver" (of the value of 12s. 6d. sterling to the ounce); or L.3950 a-year. "Due weight was assigned to the commons, by fixing the qualifications of members for districts at 300 ounces (or L.187, 10s. sterling) per annum, and of members for town at half that sum,—an exception being made in favour of professors of universities, whose learning was accepted in lieu of house and land; and, lastly, that the electors should be possessed of property to the amount of 18 ounces, or L.11, 5s.; and (which was most important of all) the right of originating every tax was reserved to the commons alone."

Such is the outline of the constitution given to Sicily by the British; and the result of this experiment is contained in the following quotation from Travels in Sicily, Greece, and Albania, by the Rev. Mr Hughes:—

"No words," says he, "can describe the scenes which daily occurred upon the introduction of the representative system in Sicily. The House of Parliament, neither moderated by discretion, nor conducted with dignity, bore the resemblance of a receptacle for

* Phrenological Journal, vol. II., p. 607.

lunatics, instead of a council-room for legislators; and the disgraceful scenes, so often enacted at the hustings in England, were here transferred to the *very floor of the senate*. As soon as the president had proposed the subject for debate, and restored some degree of order from the confusion of tongues which followed, a system of crimination and recrimination invariably commenced by several speakers, accompanied with such furious gesticulations, and hideous distortions of countenance, such bitter taunts and personal invectives, that blows generally ensued. This was the signal for universal uproar. The president's voice was unheeded and unheard; the whole House arose, partisans of different antagonists mingled in the affray, when the ground was literally covered with combatants, kicking, biting, scratching, and exhibiting all the evolutions of the old Paneratic contests. Such a state of things could not be expected to last a long time; indeed, this constitutional synod was dissolved in the very first year of its creation, and martial law established." Mr Hughes thus concludes:—"That constitution, so beautiful in theory, which rose at once like a fairy palace, vanished also like that baseless fabric, without having left a trace of its existence." Vol. i., pp. 5, 6, and 7.

After adverting to the utter profligacy of all ranks of the people, Mr Hughes observes, that "no one will wonder that difficulties environed those who endeavoured to resuscitate the embers of a patriotism already extinct, and break the fetters of a nation who rather chose to hug them; that civil liberty was received with an hypocrisy more injurious to its cause than open enmity, and that, returning without any efforts of the people, it returned without vigour, and excited neither talent nor enthusiasm; that those amongst the higher classes who received it at all, received it like a toy, which they played with for a time, and then broke to pieces; and that the populace, having penetration sufficient to discover the weakness of their rulers, were clamorous for the English authorities to dissolve the whole constitution, and take the power into their own hands." Vol. i., p. 13.

"In this instance," continues Mr Lyon, "the institution of a representative assembly, in which unlimited freedom of debate was permitted, instead of giving rise to those calm, temperate, and dignified discussions, which characterize the British House of Commons, was only the signal and the scene for confusion and uproar, where Combativeness, Destructiveness, and Self-Esteem, reigned supreme, uncontrolled by Benevolence, Veneration, or Conscientiousness; and, like wayward children, whom an indulgent father has for a time left to their own government, to convince them, perhaps, of their utter inability to guide and direct themselves, and who, finding at length the misery of unrestrained freedom, are glad to return to his firm but parental authority, and to surrender that liberty which they had only the power to abuse; so the Sicilians, not only voluntarily, but even clamorously, required that their liberty should be taken from them, and begged for the establishment of martial law as a boon."

From these examples and illustrations, I trust that you are now able to distinguish between the *independence* and the *freedom* of a nation, and are prepared to agree with me in opinion, that there can be no real freedom without prevalent intelligence and morality among the body of the people. These can be introduced only by education and training; but the general diffusion of property, by giving a direct interest to numerous individuals in the maintenance of justice, greatly promotes the progress of morality. Hence public enlightenment, morality, and wealth, constitute the grand basis of freedom.

LECTURE XVII.

DIFFERENT FORMS OF GOVERNMENT.

Despotism the best form of government in a rude state of society—Mixed form of government—Interests of the many sacrificed under despotic and oligarchical governments, to those of the few—Bad effects of hereditary artificial rank in its existing shape—Rational pride of ancestry, and true nobility of nature—Arguments in favour of hereditary rank considered: (1.) That it presents objects of respect to the people, and accustoms them to deference and obedience; (2.) That it establishes a refined and polished class, who, by their example, improve the multitude; (3.) That there is a natural and universal admiration of it, proving it to be beneficial—Bad effects of entails, and of exclusive privileges and distinctions enjoyed by individuals or classes—Forcible abolition of hereditary nobility, entails, and monopolies, reprobated—Political aspect of the United States—Tendency of the mixed form of government to promote unfairly the interests of the dominant class—This exemplified in the laws of Britain, particularly those relating to the militia and the impressment of seamen—Democratic form of government—Adapted only to a state of society in which morality and intelligence have made great and general advancement—Greek and Roman republics no exception—Character of these republics—Small Italian republics of the middle ages—Swiss republics, particularly that of Bern—Democracy in the United States—No probability that the present civilized countries of Europe will ever become barbarous—Or that the United States will fall asunder or lose their freedom—Tendency of governments to become more democratic in proportion as the people become more intelligent and moral—Groundless fears that ignorant masses of the people will gain the ascendancy.

In my last Lecture I endeavoured to expound the difference between the independence and the freedom of nations, and to trace the causes of each. I endeavoured to shew that a higher degree of moral and intellectual attainments in the people is necessary to freedom, than to mere independence.

The next topic to which I advert is the different forms of government. Phrenology enables us to arrive at clear conceptions on this subject.

The animal organs are the largest, the most powerful, and (when man is uncultivated) also the most active, in the brain; and all of them aim at selfish ends. As long, therefore, as any nation continues destitute of education, and not devoted to industrious pursuits calculated to exercise the moral and intellectual faculties, it consists of hordes of human beings in whom the animal propensities predominate, and who, in consequence, are ready to embark under any bold and energetic leader, in any enterprise that promises gratification to individual interests and passions, however immoral, or detrimental to the community at large. History is one great record of the truth of this remark. The only mode of preserving public tranquillity, and any semblance of law, in such a state of society, is for one man, or a small number of individuals, superior to the rest in vigour, sagacity, and decision, to seize on the reins of government, and to rule despotically.

Men in this condition are animals possessing the human form and human intelligence, but not yet the human morality, which alone causes individuals to love justice and become a law unto themselves. If the best and wisest of men were requested to devise a government for a nation of selfish and ferocious beings, possessed of intellect sufficient to foresee consequences, but not inspired with the love of justice, he would at once say that it must be one of great energy; vigorous to repress, and prompt to punish; otherwise there would be no tranquillity. A despotism, therefore, naturally springs up in a

very rude and barbarous country, and is the form of government best adapted to its circumstances.

The despot rules in the full spirit of the selfish system. He punishes through caprice, as often as from justice; and he rewards through favouritism, more frequently than from perception of real merit; but in doing so, he acts on the principles generally prevalent in his community. If he be enlightened, just, and beneficent, he may do great service to his people, by instructing and civilizing them; but as a general rule, he will be found acting, like themselves, on the purely selfish principle, obstructing their moral and intellectual improvement, whenever he discovers that their enlightenment will prove fatal to his own authority.

When a nation has become partially civilized, and instructed in the arts of industry, wealth is created; and a class arises, whose moral and intellectual faculties, developed by education, and stimulated by the love of property, desire to observe the dictates of morality towards their fellow-men, and to enjoy the advantages of just government themselves; a class which would not join a leader to trample the nation at large under foot, but would rather, by their wealth and intelligence, assist the people to expel a tyrant, and establish the supremacy of equitable laws. But the superior men who constitute this class, find themselves associated with a mass of uneducated and pennyless individuals, who compose the great body of the people. This was the condition of Great Britain, during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and it is partially so in the present times. The kind of government adapted to a nation composed of such elements, is obviously one which shall combine the force and energy of the despot, necessary to repress and punish all attempts at individual supremacy and domination, and at the same time enforce order and justice, with a due regard to the general welfare. A mixed form of government, like the British, in which great executive power is committed to the king, but in which the enlightened classes, through their representatives in Parliament, enact the laws, and also control the executive, by granting or withholding the public supplies, is the natural result of this state of society.

The great benefit, I have said, of freedom, is, that it tends to promote the general welfare; whereas all other forms of government, whether despotic, under one supreme prince, or oligarchical, under a limited number of nobles, tend to the sacrifice of the interests of the many to the advantage of the few. In all ages and countries this has been the case, and in our own mixed form of government the evil also exists.

In ancient Rome, in which the patricians or nobles ruled the state, there was a law prohibiting the intermarriage of patricians and plebeians; that is, of the nobles and the people. In Rome, besides, all places of trust, power, and influence, were confined to the patricians, and a plebeian could not, for many ages, aspire to the honours of the consulship. In France, before the Revolution, only nobles could obtain military rank. In Hindostan, and in some Roman Catholic countries, the priests prohibit the people at large from freely reading their scriptures or sacred books. In short, the genius of selfishness tramples on justice, and grasps at advantages for itself; it is everywhere, and at all times, the same, whether appearing in an individual or in a class, in a political body or a religious corporation.

In a former lecture I endeavoured to point out that a hereditary nobility, protected by law in the possession of political power and exclusive privileges, without regard to individual qualities and attainments, is an infringement of the natural laws,

and produces evil to the community, not only by the abuses of power which it commits, but by the misdirection which it gives to the sentiment of ambition in the public mind. I now remark, that the existence of a noble or privileged class is one of the characteristic features of a mixed form of government, like that of Britain, and is the natural result of a portion of the people having far outstript the mass in wealth, intelligence, and refinement; and it may be expected to endure as long as the great inequality in these particulars, on which it is founded, exists.

The mixed form of government itself obviously arises when a numerous class has considerably preceded the mass of the people in intelligence and moral attainments; and it exhibits the spectacle of that class becoming the sole depositaries of political power. The upper portion, or nobles, exercise the function of legislators directly in their own persons, and the inferior portion do so by means of representatives, leaving no political influence whatever to the majority of the people. It is the genius of this form of government to confer privileges on classes; and hence the highest members of the ruling body easily induced the king to bestow on them the character of nobility, and the right of hereditary legislation; but as the great principle of doing to another as we would wish another to do to us, leads, in its general application, to the removal of all distinctions not founded on real superiority, the existence of this class becomes, in course of time, an obstacle to general improvement. There is one principle, however, equally clearly taught, both by Christianity and by the doctrine of the supremacy of the moral sentiments,—that the only beneficial manner of producing a moral equality, is by improving and raising up the lower, and not by pulling down the higher classes, possessed of superior attainments. As long, therefore, as the class of nobles are superior in intellect, moral qualities, and education, to the great body of the people, their superiority is real; and they would maintain this superiority, although they possessed neither titles nor exclusive privileges. This has long been the state of Britain, and is so, to a considerable extent, still. In a former lecture, I pointed out that hereditary rank and superiority is in opposition to nature, unless the organic laws are obeyed, and that then, statutes are not needed to transmit property and honour to posterity. Those who transmit high moral, intellectual, and physical qualities to their offspring, confer on them the stamp of Nature's nobility, and they need no other.

When the Creator bestowed on us Veneration, prompting us to reverence high qualities and attainments, and Love of Approbation, desiring distinction for ourselves, He must have intended that these faculties, in selecting their objects, should be guided by reason, morality, and religion; yet the creation of artificial, and especially hereditary rank, which shall enable its possessor, independently of his mental qualities, to assume superiority over, and take precedence of, other men, even when these are more virtuous, more learned, more useful, and more highly accomplished than himself, is in direct opposition to this maxim, and must, therefore, manifestly be an abuse. The grand argument by which it is defended is, that, by presenting objects of established respect and consideration to the people, we accustom them to the practice of deference and obedience, and thereby promote the tranquillity of the state. It is argued also, that, by instituting a class of nobles, a branch of society is formed which will cultivate, as their especial province, taste, refinement, and all the elegancies of life, and improve the inferior members of the social body by their example. It is further maintained, that such a class is natural, and

has existed in almost all countries, and must therefore be advantageous. In a certain state of society, these reasons have some weight; but my position is, that, when the general body of the people become enlightened, these advantages disappear, and a hereditary nobility becomes a positive evil.

I beg leave, however, to state, that I do not propose to abolish hereditary and artificial rank by violence, and against the will of its possessors. The grand principle which I have advocated in these lectures, that all real improvement must proceed from the supremacy of the moral and intellectual faculties, forbids such a project. My aim is, to render nobles ashamed of hereditary titles, decorations, and privileges, which testify nothing in favour of their merit; and I regard this as undoubtedly practicable, in the course of a few generations, merely by enlightening their superior faculties. If you trace the forms in which Self-Esteem and Love of Approbation seek gratification in different stages of social improvement, and observe how these approach nearer and nearer to reason, in proportion as society becomes enlightened, you will not consider this idea chimerical. In the "Constitution of Man," I have remarked, that the tattooed skin, and nose transixed with ornamental bones, are profoundly respected and greatly prized by the savage. These are the external signs of his consequence,—the outward symbols by which his Self-Esteem and Love of Approbation demand and receive the homage of inferior men. But a very limited advance in civilization destroys the illusion. It is seen that these are mere physical ornaments, which bespeak nothing but the vanity of the wearer; they are, therefore, ridiculed and laid aside.

Ascending to a more refined yet still barbarous age, you find that the marks of distinction formerly prized in our own country, were a full-bottomed wig and cocked hat, ruffles at the wrists, a laced waistcoat, and buckles in the shoes. A century ago, when a man thus attired appeared in any assembly of the common people, place was given to his rank, and respect was paid to his dignity, as if he had been of a superior nature. But when, in the progress of enlightenment, it was discovered that these outward testimonials of greatness, were merely the workmanship of barbers and tailors, men who enjoyed any real mental superiority, who were distinguished by refinement of manners, and the other qualities of a true gentleman, became ashamed of them, and preferred to wear plain yet elegant attire, and to trust to their own manners and the discrimination of the public, for being recognised as of superior rank, and being treated accordingly; and they have been completely successful. A gentleman in the trappings of the year 1700, appearing in our streets now would be regarded as insane, or as facetiously disporting himself in order to win a wager.

The progress of reason which has swept away tattooed skins, bone ornaments in the nose, full-bottomed wigs, and laced waistcoats, will one day extinguish orders of knighthood, coronets, and all the other artificial means by which men at present attempt to support their claims to respect and consideration, apart from their personal qualities and virtues. They will be recognised by the wearers as well as by the public, as devices useful *only to the unworthy*. An advanced education and civilization will render men acute observers of the real elements of greatness, and profound admirers of them, but equally intolerant of tinsel impositions.

The greatest danger to which the British nobility is at present exposed, is that which arises from their own imperfect education. While the middle classes have been reforming their schools, colleges, and universities, and rendering them vehicles, to a greater or less extent, of useful knowledge, based on science

and the laws of nature; and, while the working classes have been pursuing the same course of instructive and elevating study in works of cheap literature, the high aristocracy has been clinging to Greek, Latin, History, and Mathematics, as the staple of their instruction, and been fairly left behind.* In the extensive and important discussions of social interests which lately agitated the country,* the ignorance of the titled aristocracy concerning the natural laws which regulate manufactures, agriculture, capital, and commerce, and which, as legislators of a commercial country, they were bound to understand, became the subject of universal remark; while the magnitude of their antiquated prejudices, and their general incapacity for comprehensive, profound, and logical reasoning, struck their own educated friends and admirers with dismay. The causes of this inferiority are to be found in the low state of education in the schools of Eton and Westminster, and in the universities of Oxford and Cambridge, in which the aristocracy are trained. Mr Lyell, in his *Travels in America*, says, "after the year 1839, we may consider three-fourths of the sciences still nominally taught at Oxford to have been virtually exiled from the university. The class-rooms of the professors were, some of them entirely, others nearly deserted. Chemistry and Botany attracted, between the years 1840 and 1844, from three to seven students; Geometry, Astronomy, and Experimental Philosophy, scarcely more; Mineralogy and Geology, still taught by the same professor who, fifteen years before, had attracted crowded audiences, from ten to twelve; Political Economy still fewer; even Ancient History and Poetry scarcely commanded an audience; and, strange to say, in a country with whose destinies those of India are so closely bound up, the first of Asiatic scholars gave lectures to one or two pupils; and these might have been absent, had not the cherished hope of a Boden scholarship for Sanscrit induced them to attend." During his last course, the professor of Geology lectured to an audience of three! If this state of education of the aristocracy continues, no ghost is needed to predict their downfall. The enlarged and enlightened understandings of the middle and lower classes cannot worship moral and intellectual phantoms, however large their possessions, and ancient their lineage. Their extinction is decreed, and neither violence nor revolution will be needed to accomplish it. Only leave them to themselves to pursue their present course of education, and in half a century they will be no more!

Perhaps you do not perceive that society will have gained much when this change shall have been accomplished; yet I anticipate decided advantages from it. Self-Esteem and Love of Approbation exist, and have large and powerful organs. The feelings with which they inspire the mind, will never be extinguished; their *direction* only can be changed. When we contemplate the history of the world, and perceive what laborious, painful, and dangerous enterprises men have undertaken and accomplished, and what privations and sufferings they have submitted to, in order to obtain the gratification of these two faculties, we may form some estimate of the impulse which would be given to physical, moral, and intellectual improvement, if we were withdrawn from the worship of hollow idols, and directed to nobler objects. Men will always desire to stand high in rank, to be respected, and to be treated with consideration by their fellow-men, but their notions of what constitutes nobility and high rank will be elevated, as their minds become enlightened. As

* The subject was Free Trade and Abolition of the Corn-Laws, March 1846.

formerly remarked, under the system of nature, a family would esteem itself noble, when it was able to shew in its genealogy a long line of healthy, handsome, refined, moral, intelligent, and useful men and women, with few profligates, and few imbeciles; and an individual would present before an intelligent public, high intellectual attainments, pure morals, and refined manners, as the foundations of his claim to social consideration.

If you conceive nobles and individuals of high rank and remote ancestry animated by such motives, and setting such examples before their inferiors, what a powerful impulse would be given to improvement, compared with that which flows from the present state of opinion, when men, overlooking the real elements of greatness, worship the external symbols of vanity, and elevate mediocrity, if sufficiently rich, to the station which should be held only by the most able, virtuous, and accomplished!

We are now prepared to answer the arguments by which hereditary rank and artificial nobility are defended, as advantageous in the present state of Britain. The first is that their existence presents objects of respect to the common people, and accustoms them to the practice of deference and obedience. I reply, that the common people respected the decorations of rank,—the wig, the ruffles, and the waistcoats, of the last century,—only while they were deplorably ignorant; and, in like manner, they will regard, with deference and awe, ancient titles apart from merit, only while they continue in the same condition. The moment they become sufficiently enlightened and independent in their moral and intellectual judgments to arrive at sound conclusions, they will cease to admire hereditary rank without high qualities. It is therefore neither moral, safe, nor advantageous, to resort to means for cultivating the respectful feelings of the people, that will not bear the investigation of enlightened reason;—the end in view cannot be attained by such a method.

The secondary defence of hereditary nobility is, that, by instituting it, you establish a separate class dedicated to refinement, taste, and elegance, who by their example will improve the inferior orders. The answer is, that all these qualities are essential elements in Nature's nobility, and that after a certain stage of social enlightenment has been reached, they will be assiduously cultivated for their own sake, and for the distinction which they will confer; and that therefore, patents of nobility, to preserve individuals who lack these high attainments in their minds, in possession of the outward advantages generally attending them, are not necessary for social welfare. I am a strong advocate for refinement, and clearly perceive that the higher classes possess much more of it than the middle and lower ranks; and, viewing it as one important element in a truly excellent and noble character, I am anxious to see it prized, and more generally cultivated, by the lower grades. But the best way to bring about this result, is to dissipate the essentially vulgar illusion, that descent, title, or any artificial or accidental circumstance, can produce it, or can exclude any individual from attaining it; and thereby induce all to esteem it for its own sake, and to respect those only who really possess it.

The third argument in favour of hereditary and artificial rank is, that the admiration of it is natural, and has existed in all ages and countries, and that it must, therefore, be beneficial. I have already explained, that the faculties of Veneration, Self-Esteem, and Love of Approbation, are all natural, and that one of their tendencies is to respect and esteem ancient descent and superior qualities. The only difference between the admirers of things as they are and myself, consists in this,—that they present arti-

ficial objects to which these faculties may be directed, and which objects, when examined by reason, are found to be unworthy of enlightened regard; whereas, I propose to have them directed only according to reason, to objects pleasing at once to the understanding, to the moral sentiments, and to these faculties themselves; and beneficial to society.

At present, it is the interest of artificial nobles to keep the people ignorant, rude, and superstitious; because men in such a condition are best fitted to worship idols; and, accordingly, the agricultural labourers, who are placed by Providence directly under the influence of the landed aristocracy, have, as a class, been most thoroughly neglected. While the lords of the soil have been wallowing in luxury, they, the instruments of their wealth and power, have been allowed to pine in abject poverty and ignorance. And the most purely aristocratic, unintellectual, and poorly gifted among peers, have always been the greatest opponents of the emancipation, education, and elevation of the people; while, on the contrary, all the truly noble minds born among the aristocracy,—those on whom Nature has set the stamp of moral as well as intellectual greatness,—have been their friends and willing benefactors. If there were no nobility except that of Nature, her nobles would be prompted by interest as well as inclination, to promote the improvement and elevation of all classes, because they would feel that their own rank, happiness, and usefulness, depended on having a cultivated, discriminating, moral, and intellectual community for their associates and admirers.

I have dwelt on this subject longer than some of you may consider to have been necessary; but the same principles have a wide application. They lead us to the conclusion, that hereditary entails, as constituted in Scotland, ought also to be abolished. In England, an entail is limited to the lives of the heirs in existence at the time when it is executed; but in Scotland it may extend to perpetuity, if heirs exist so long. In this country an entail is a deed in law executed by the proprietor of an estate, by which he calls a certain series of heirs, without limitation, to enjoyment of the rents, or produce, or possession of the land, but without allowing to any one of them a right of property in itself. None of them can sell the estate, or burden it with debt, beyond his own lifetime, or give it to a different order of heirs from that pointed out in the deed of entail. If, for example, the property be destined to heirs-male, the present possessor may have a daughter, who is the apple of his eye and the treasure of his heart, and no male relation nearer than a tenth cousin, and this cousin may be a profligate of the most disgraceful description; but the law is blind—the daughter cannot inherit one acre of the vast domain, and the remote and unworthy male heir will take it all. This, however, is comparatively the least of the evils attending entails. Their existence maintains in an artificial rank, and in possession of great wealth and influence, individuals who, by their natural qualities, ought to stand at the bottom of the scale, and who, like the hereditary nobility, operate as idols on the minds of the aspiring and rising of the middle and lower ranks, leading them to an insensate worship of aristocracy.

Many persons may imagine that this is a small social evil, affecting only the individuals who give way to it, and who, they suppose, are not numerous. But it appears to me to be of greater magnitude, and to lead to more extensive consequences. It supports, by the sanction of the law, the erroneous principle of preserving social greatness and influence to individuals, independently of their natural qualities; which tends directly to encourage all classes to overlook or undervalue natural excellence, and to strive

only to attain wealth, and to preserve it in their families, by the aid of legal technicalities, against the law of God, and the welfare of their fellow-men. This averting of the general mind from the real principles of social improvement, and giving it a false direction, appears to be the worst evil attending all artificial systems for preserving family distinctions.* The class which is thus supported, has many powerful motives for improvement withdrawn from it: it leans upon crutches, and rarely exercises its native strength; and, as a natural consequence, it looks with an indifferent, if not a hostile eye, on all its inferiors who are labouring to attain that excellence which itself despises. A great deal of the lukewarmness, if not positive aversion, manifested by some of the higher ranks, to the instruction and refinement of the people, may be traced to the consciousness that their own pretensions rest, to a great extent, on an artificial basis, and on illusions which must inevitably yield before an advanced and generally diffused civilization.

The same arguments which I have now employed against artificial rank and entails, apply to all exclusive privileges and distinctions conferred by law on individuals or classes, independently of their merits. The social institutions of every country in Europe have been tarnished, more or less by such abuses. In France, before the Revolution, every class of the people except the lowest, had its exclusive privileges, and every town and department its selfish rights of monopoly or exemption, which were maintained with all the blind avidity usually displayed by an unenlightened selfishness. The Revolution swept these away, and made all France and all Frenchmen equal in their rights and privileges, to the great advantage of the whole nation. In our own country, the spirit of reform is busy extinguishing similar marks of barbarism, but they are still clung to with great affection by the true adherents of the individual interest system.

The brief limits of this course prevent me from entering into farther details on this subject; but I again beg of you not to misunderstand me. He who should go forth from this hall, and report that the great object of my lectures on Moral Philosophy was to recommend the abolition by force of hereditary nobility, entails, and monopolies, would do me injustice. The real object of this course has been, to shew that men must obey the laws of God before they can be happy—that one of these laws is, that we should love our neighbours as ourselves, or in other words, that individual enjoyment is inseparably connected with, and dependent on, social welfare; that, to promote the general welfare, it is necessary to render all the members of the community alive to its improvement, and to withdraw from them all artificial means of propping up their individual fortunes and rank, independently of virtue; that hereditary titles, entails, and other exclusive privileges of classes and individuals, are the fortifications in which the selfish principle entrenches itself, in order to resist and obstruct general improvement, and that, on *this account*, they should be undermined and destroyed. I have endeavoured to shew that the classes who now imagine themselves

to be benefited by them, would actually profit by their abolition, by being directed into the true paths of happiness and virtue; and I propose, by enlightening their understandings, and elevating the standards of public approbation, to induce a voluntary surrender of these distinctions, and not a forcible abrogation of them. Ages may elapse before these results will be accomplished, but so did many centuries intervene between the painted skins and the laced coat; and so did generations pass away between the embroidered waistcoats and our own age; yet our day has come, and so will a brighter day arrive, although *we* may be long removed from the scene before it dawns.

Since the foregoing remarks were written, I have lived for twenty months in the United States of North America, where no hereditary nobility, no privileged classes, and no entails exist. It is impossible not to perceive that, in their absence, the higher faculties of the mind have a freer field of action. At the same time, truth compels me to remark, that as they were abolished in the United States by a sudden exercise of power, and as a system of equality was introduced as the result of a successful revolution, and did not arise spontaneously from the cultivation of the public mind and the development of the moral and intellectual faculties of the people, the democracy of the United States does not present all that enlightenment of the understanding, that high-minded love of the beneficial and the just, that refinement of manners, and that well-regulated self-control, which constitute the most valuable fruits of political freedom. In the United States the selfish faculties appear to me to be as active and as blind as in Britain. The political institutions of the country are in advance of the mental cultivation of the mass of the people; and the most cheering consideration for the philanthropist, in the prospect of the future, is the fact, that these institutions having given supreme power to the people, of which there is no possibility of depriving them, it is equally the interest and the duty of men of all ranks and conditions to concur in elevating them in the scale of moral, religious, and intellectual improvement, so as, in time, to render them worthy of their high calling among nations. Much remains to be accomplished.

The great characteristic of the mixed form of government is its tendency to promote the interests of the classes who wield political power to the injury of the others. Ever since Britain apparently attained freedom, there has been an evident system of legislating for the advantage and gratification of the dominant class. The laws of primogeniture, of entails, and of the non-liability of heritable property in legacy-duty; the game-laws, the corn-laws, and the heavy duties imposed on foreign timber, are all instances in which the aristocracy have legislated for themselves, at the expense of the people. In proportion, again, as the mercantile classes acquired political power, they followed the same example: They induced Parliament to pass acts for encouraging the shipping interests, the fisheries, the linen-manufacture, and a great variety of other interests, by paying, out of the public purse, direct bounties to those engaged in them, or by laying protecting duties, to be paid by the public, on the rival produce of foreign nations.* In the administration of public affairs, the same principle was followed. The army and navy, the church and the colonies, and all other departments of the public service, were converted into great pasture-fields for the sons and political

* By a strange coincidence, while this sheet is in the press, the following advertisement has appeared in the newspapers:—"A meeting of the proprietors of entailed estates in Scotland, for the purpose of considering the great national evils connected with the law of entail, and the propriety of an immediate application to the Legislature thereupon, is hereby requested to be held on Thursday, the 12th day of March, within the Hopetoun Rooms, Queen Street, Edinburgh, at one o'clock. (Signed) BREADALBANE; D. BAIRD, Bart.; JAMES BOWELL, Bart.; W. D. GILLON of Wallhouse; W. MACKENZIE of Muirton.—Edinburgh, 3d March 1816." Let us wish this effort every success!

* These selfish, erroneous, and prejudicial principles of legislation are now disavowed by Mr Cobden, and all the enlightened leaders of the manufacturing and mercantile classes. 1846.

dependents of the aristocracy; while there were combination-laws against the labouring classes, to punish them for uniting to raise the price of their labour, and laws authorizing sailors to be impressed and forced to serve in the navy, at wages inferior to the common rate allowed in merchants' ships; and even the militia-laws, although apparently equal, were actually contrived to throw the whole burden of service on the lower orders. The penalty on men of all ranks for non-appearance to be enrolled was L.20. This, to a labouring man whose income was 10s. a-week, was equal to forty weeks' labour; or, to an artisan who earned 20s. a-week, it was equal to twenty weeks' wages. To a master-tradesman, a merchant, professional man, or small proprietor, whose revenue was L.365 per annum, it was equal only to twenty days' income. To have produced equality, the fine ought to have been computed at the amount of a certain number of days' income for all classes. According to this rule, a man having L.360 per annum of income, would have paid L.140 of fine, when a mechanic, who earned 20s. a-week, would have paid L.20, or a labourer, with 10s. a-week, L.10. A great proprietor, enjoying L.50,000 a-year, would then have paid L.20,000 of fine, for exemption from service.

If the operative classes had had a voice in Parliament proportionate to their numbers, there is no doubt that this would have been the rule; and if so, it would have rendered the militia-system so intolerably burdensome to the middle and higher classes, that its existence would have been brief, and means might perhaps have been discovered for bringing the last French war to a more speedy termination.

In the British army, the law allows a wounded officer a gratuity corresponding to the severity of his injury; while it not only provides no immediate compensation to the wounded common soldier, but actually charges him with hospital expenses during his cure. In virtue of a war-office order, when a soldier is received into a military hospital, 10d. a-day at home, and 9d. a-day on foreign service, is deducted from his pay while he continues a patient, and no exception is made in cases of wounds received in battle. See "Explanatory directions for the information and guidance of Pay-masters and others; War-Office, 20th Nov. 1830:" § 283, 284.

It is argued that impressment of seamen is indispensable to the defence of the country; but no such necessity exists, if justice were done to sailors. Let the country recompense equitably their services and these will not be withheld.

The great argument in my mind for abolishing impressment, is, that when seamen must be enticed by high wages and good treatment to enter into ships of war, it will be necessary for naval officers to become just, intelligent, and kind, because it will only be by such qualities that crews will be retained and authority preserved over them. Sailors themselves, by being well treated, will be improved. War will be softened in its horrors, when waged by men thus civilized; and I hope that the additional costliness of it, on such a system, will tend to induce the public generally to put an end to it altogether.

If I am right in these views, the mixed form of government is one adapted to a particular stage of civilization, that in which an intelligent class co-exists with an ignorant mass; but it is not the perfection of human institutions.

The next form of government presented to our consideration is the *democratic*, or that in which political power is deposited exclusively in the people, and by them delegated to magistrates, chosen, for a longer or shorter period, by themselves.

If the world be really governed by God on the

principle of the supremacy of the moral and intellectual faculties, our social miseries must arise from individuals and classes pursuing their separate interests, regardless of those of the rest of the community; and, in this view, the sooner all ranks enjoy political power, the sooner will legislation assume a truly moral character, and benefit the entire nation. But keeping in view the other principle which I have endeavoured to expound—that men are incapable of steadily pursuing moral and just objects, until their moral and intellectual faculties have been well trained and enlightened—you will perceive that no nation can become fit for a republican form of government, until all classes of the people have been adequately and nearly equally instructed. The ancient republics of Greece and Rome form no exceptions to this rule. They were confined to a very small territory, and the citizens of each republic were for many ages within reach of personal communication with each other, so that there existed some degree of equality of intelligence among them. Whenever their boundaries became extensive, their free government ceased, and was superseded by despotism. But these ancient republics never were moral institutions. Their freedom, so far as it existed, resulted from the equal balance of selfishness and power in the different classes of the community; or from the rivalry of their different orators and leaders, who destroyed each other, as they respectively attempted to usurp an undue share of authority. The people in their assemblies, and the senators in their senates, were often guilty of the most unjust and unprincipled tyranny against individuals; and altogether, the boasted liberties of Greece and Rome appear only as the concessions of equally matched combatants, always withdrawn when equality in the power of aggression and resistance ceased to exist. The reason of this is obvious. In those states, there was no true religion, no moral training, no printing-presses, and no science of nature. The great mass of the people were ignorant; and experience teaches us that although a people, enjoying large brains and active temperaments, situate in a fine climate, but destitute of moral and intellectual training, may have been ingenious and acute, yet that they must have been turbulent and immoral; and such these ancients really were. Their monuments and records which have reached us, are the works of a few distinguished men who arose among them, and who certainly displayed high genius in the fine arts, in literature, and eloquence; but these were the educated and the talented few. From the very necessity of their circumstances, without science, and without printed books, the mass of the people must have been profoundly ignorant, the slaves of the animal propensities. Their domestic habits, as well as their public conduct, shew that this was the case. The popular religion of the ancient nations was a mass of revolting absurdities and superstitions. Their wives were reduced to the condition of mere domestic drudges, and the hours of recreation of the men were devoted to concubines. Their public entertainments were sanguinary combats, in which ferocious men put each other to death, or in which wild animals tore each other to pieces. All labour was performed by slaves, whom they treated in the cruellest manner. They pursued war and conquest as their national occupations, and in their public acts they occasionally banished or condemned to death their best and most upright citizens. These are facts, which we read of in the histories of Greece and Rome. They exhibit the vigorous ascendancy of the animal propensities, and the feeble power of the moral sentiments, as clearly as if we saw the barbarian crowds standing before us in all their prowess and ferocity.

In the middle ages, a number of small republics sprang up in Italy, and we are dazzled by representations of their wealth, magnificence, and freedom. One observation applies to them all. They exhibited the dominion of an oligarchy over the people, and the ruling classes practised the most disgraceful tyranny, wherever they were not restrained by fear of each other. Most of them ultimately fell before the power of the larger monarchies, and are now extinct.

Switzerland presents a brighter prospect. As it was the first country in Europe which acquired freedom, so has it longest preserved the blessing. The moral and intellectual qualities of the people, which I described in my last lecture, fitted them for free governments, and the Swiss nation constituted itself into a congeries of republics, acting in federation, but each independent in its internal administration. In the course of time, power fell into the hands of an aristocratic class there, as in Italy, but the native qualities of the Swiss mind seem to have warded off the consequences which in other countries generally ensued. "The members of the Sovereign Council of Bern," we are told,* "were elected for life, and every ten years there was an election to supply the vacancies that had occurred during that period. The councillors themselves were the electors; and as old families became extinct, and as it was a rule that there should not be less than eighty families having members in the great council, vacancies were supplied from new families of burghers. Still, the number of families in whose hands the government was vested was comparatively small; and several unsuccessful attempts were made, in the course of the eighteenth century, to alter this state of things, and to reinstate the assemblies of the body of the burghers. The discontent, however, was far from general, and it did not extend to the country population. The administration was conducted in an orderly, unostentatious, and economical manner; the taxes were few and light. 'It would be difficult,' says the historian Muller, 'to find in the history of the world a commonwealth which, for so long a period, has been so wisely administered as that of Bern. In other aristocracies, the subjects were kept in darkness, poverty, and barbarism; factions were encouraged amongst them, while justice winked at crime or took bribes; and this was the case in the dependencies of Venice. But the people of Bern stood, with regard to their patricians, rather in the relation of clients towards their patrons, than in that of subjects towards their sovereigns.' Zschokke, a later Swiss historian, speaking of Bern, and other aristocracies of Switzerland, says, 'They acted like scrupulous guardians. The magistrates, even the highest amongst them, received small salaries; fortunes were made only in foreign service, or in the common bailiwicks of the subject districts. Although the laws were defective and trials secret, the love of justice prevailed in the country; power wisely respected the rights of the humblest freeman. In the principal towns, especially the Protestant ones, wealth fostered science and the fine arts. Bern opened fine roads, raised public buildings, fostered agriculture in its fine territory, relieved those districts that were visited by storms or inundations, founded establishments for the weak and the helpless, and yet contrived to accumulate considerable sums in its treasury. But the old patriotism of the Swiss slumbered; it was replaced by selfishness, and the mind remained stationary; the various cantons were estranged from each other; instruction spread in the towns, but coarseness and ignorance prevailed in the country.' The consequence of all this was, that when the storm

came from abroad, it found the Swiss unprepared to face it. The French republic, in its career of aggression, did not respect the neutrality of Switzerland," but seized upon its territory and treasures, and inflicted on it the greatest calamities. In 1815, an aristocratical constitution was given to Bern, under the sanction of the allied powers who de-throned Napoleon; but in 1830, the canton of Bern, and several others, again changed their government, and became democratic republics. "The new constitution has now (1835) been in force for more than three years; notwithstanding some heart-burnings and party ebullitions, things appear to be settling into a regular system, and no act of violence or open bloodshed has accompanied the change."

This account of Bern appears remarkable, when compared with the history of other republics, the ruling factions of which, when allowed the privilege of self-election, life-tenures of office, and freedom from responsibility, invariably became selfish and unprincipled tyrants, converting the laws into engines of oppression, and the revenues of the state into sources of private gain. I can account for the superiority of the Swiss only by the larger endowment of the moral and reflecting organs in their brains, which seems to have been a characteristic feature in the people from a very remote period, and which still continues. The Swiss skulls in the possession of the Phrenological Society, present higher developments of the moral and intellectual organs than those of any other of the continental nations which I have seen. The Germans, who are originally the same people, in many districts, resemble them; but they vary much in different places. The Swiss brain, I may also notice, is not equally favourably developed in all the cantons. In Bern, Geneva, and Zurich, the combinations are the best; at least this struck me in travelling through the country.

I introduce these remarks, to direct your attention to the fact, that the development of the brain is a most important element in judging of the adaptation of any particular people for any particular form of government; a principle which is entirely lost sight of by those philosophers who believe that all men are naturally equal in their dispositions and intellectual capacities, and that a free government is equally suited to all.

The conclusion which I draw in regard to the republican form of government is, that no people is fit for it in whom the moral and intellectual organs are not largely developed, and in whom also they are not generally and extensively cultivated. The reason is clear. The propensities being all selfish, any talented leader, who will address himself strongly to the interests and prejudices of an ignorant people, will carry their suffrages to any scheme which he may propose, and he will speedily render himself a dictator and them slaves. If there be a numerous dominant class equally talented and enlightened, the individuals among them will keep each other in check, but they will rule as an oligarchy, in the spirit of a class, and trample the people under their feet. Thus it appears, that, by the ordination of Providence, the people have no alternative but to acquire virtue and knowledge; to embrace large, liberal, and enlightened views; and to pursue moral and beneficial objects,—or to suffer oppression. This is another of the proofs that the moral government of the world is based on the principle of the supremacy of the moral sentiments and intellect; for, turn where we will, we find suffering linked with selfishness, and enjoyment with benevolence and justice, in public as well as in private affairs.

The United States of North America present the best example of a democracy which has hitherto appeared in the history of the world. Power is there

* Penny Cyclopædia, article BERN vol. iv. *4.

lodged with the entire people; and their magistrates, from the lowest to the highest, are truly the delegates of the national authority. Yet, in the older states of the Union, life and property are as secure as in any country in the world, and liberty is more complete. In my last lecture, I traced, in the history of this people, their preparation for freedom. The founders of American society were moral, religious, and industrious men, flying from injustice and oppression; and were, therefore, probably men of the keenest moral and religious feelings to be found in the old world, at the time when they emigrated to America. Their ranks continued to be recruited from the industrious and enterprising sons of Europe; and hence, when they threw off the yoke of Britain, the *material* of the States consisted chiefly of minds of the best quality. Since they acquired their independence, they have continued to advance in education, morality, and intelligence; and the extent of education is considerably greater there than in any other country in the world, certain portions of Germany, perhaps, being alone excepted. In Britain and France, you will find more *highly* educated men; but beside them, you will perceive countless multitudes of human beings enveloped in the profoundest ignorance. In America, you will meet with few men of such eminent culture and attainments as England and France can boast of; but you will look in vain for the masses of uneducated stolidity which are the disgrace of Europe. The American people are *nearly all* to some extent educated. They are not only able, on an emergency, to read and write, but they are in the daily habit of reading; and they understand the great principles of morals, political economy, and government, better than the uneducated classes of this country. The co-existence of the greatest freedom, therefore, with the highest general intelligence, in America, is in harmony with the doctrines which I am now endeavouring to expound.

[The foregoing observations were written before I had visited the United States, and were founded on such information as I had then obtained from communications with individuals who had lived in them, and from books. After enjoying the advantages of personal observation, I allow these remarks to remain, as essentially correct; but I find that I have over-estimated the attainments of the mass of the people in the United States. The *machinery* for education which they have instituted, and which they support by taxation, or voluntary contribution, is great and valuable, and rather exceeds than falls short of my preconceived opinions: but the *quality and quantity* of the education dispensed by it, are far inferior to what I had imagined. The *things taught*, and the *modes* of teaching, in the public or common schools which educate the people, are greatly inferior to what are found in the improved schools of Britain. While, therefore, I retain the observation, "that the people generally understand the great principles of morals, political economy, and government, better than the uneducated classes of Britain," I must add the qualification that the difference between the two, is only like that between moonlight* and the light of the stars. In regard to the scientific principles of morals, political economy, and government, especially of the first and the second, the people of the United States appear to me to be greatly in the dark. At the same time, there are many enlightened philanthropists among them, who see and deplore this ignorance, and are labouring assiduously, and I have no doubt successfully, to re-

move it. The impulse towards a *higher* education is, at this time, strong and energetic; and as the Americans are a *practical* people, I anticipate a great and rapid improvement. In Massachusetts, the Hon. Horace Mann is devoting the whole powers of his great and enlightened mind to the advancement of the common schools, and he is ably and zealously seconded by the Government and enlightened coadjutors. The results cannot fail to be highly advantageous. The people of the United States owe it to themselves, and to the cause of freedom all over the world, to exhibit the spectacle of a refined, enlightened, moral, and intellectual democracy. Every male above twenty-one years of age among them, claims to be a sovereign. He is, therefore, *bound to be a gentleman*. The great cause of the extravagance and apparent unsteadiness of democracy in the United States, appears to me to be referrible to the extreme youth, and consequent excitability and want of experience of the majority of their voters. The population doubles itself by natural increase every twenty-five years, and hence the proportion of the young to the aged is much greater than in European countries. The franchise is enjoyed at the age of 21, and the majority of their voters are under 35, so that the country is governed to a great extent by the passion, rashness, and inexperience, instead of by the wisdom and virtue of its people.]

The history of the world has shewn nations degenerating, and losing the independence and freedom which they once possessed, and it is prophesied that America will lose her freedom, and become a kingdom in the course of years; or, that her states will fall asunder and destroy each other. It is supposed also, that the civilised nations of Europe will become corrupt, and, through excessive refinement, sink into effeminacy, and proceed from effeminacy to ignorance, from ignorance to barbarism, and thence to dissolution. This has been the fate of the great nations of antiquity; and it is argued that, as there is nothing new under the sun, what *has been, will be*, and that the ultimate destruction of European civilization is certain; while it is admitted that freedom, art, and science, may flourish in some other region of the globe. The principle in philosophy, that similar causes, in similar circumstances, produce similar effects, admits of no exception; and if modern Europe and the United States of America were in the same condition in which the monarchies and republics of the ancient world existed, I should at once subscribe to the conclusion. But in the ancient governments, the mass of the people, owing to the want of printing, never were educated or civilized; and even the attainments of the ruling classes were extremely limited. They had literature and the fine arts, but they had no sound morality, no pure religion, little science, and very few of the useful arts which have resulted from science. The national greatness of those ages, therefore, was not the growth of the common mind, but arose from the genius of a few individuals, aided by accidental circumstances. It was like the dominion of France in our own day, when the military talents of Napoleon extended her sway from Naples to Moscow, and from Lisbon to Vienna; but which, resting on no superiority in the French people over the people of the conquered nations, was dissolved in a day, even under the eye of the commanding genius who had raised it.

When we apply the history of the past as an index to the events of the future, the condition of *like circumstances* is wanting; for Europe and the United States are in the progress (however slow) of presenting, for the first time in the world, the spectacle of an universally educated people; and on this account, I do not subscribe to the probability of civilization perishing, or modern nations becoming effe-

* An American gentleman, who is much interested in his country's welfare, on reading this passage remarked, "You may say moonlight when the moon is in the first quarter."

minate and corrupt. The discovery of the natural laws, and those of organization in particular, will guard them against this evil. It is true, that only a few states in Europe have yet organized the means of universally educating the people; but Prussia, France, Holland, and Switzerland, have done so, and Britain is becoming anxious to follow their example. The others must pursue the same course, for their own security and welfare. A barbarous people cannot exist in safety beside enlightened nations.

For the same reasons, I do not anticipate the dissolution of the union of the States of North America, or that they will lose their freedom. They are advancing in knowledge and morality; and whenever the conviction becomes general, that the interests of the whole States are in harmony, which they undoubtedly are, the miserable attempts to foster the industry of one at the expense of another will be given up, and they may live in amity, and flourish long, the boast of the world, so far as natural causes of dissolution are concerned. This expectation is founded on the hope that they will give a *real* education to their people; an education which shall render them conversant with the great principles of morals and political economy; so that they may know that there is a power above themselves, that of nature and nature's God, whose laws they must obey before they can be prosperous and happy. I assume, also, that means will be found to expunge the blot and pestilence of slavery from their free institutions. It is a canker which will consume the vitals of the Union, if it be not in time eradicated. These expectations may appear to some to be bold and chimerical; but truth's triumphs have no limits; and justice, when once recognised as a rule of action, which it emphatically is in the institutions of the United States, cannot be arrested midway in its career.

The greatest dangers to the institutions of the United States are now impending over them. The people are young, prosperous, rapidly increasing, and still very imperfectly instructed. The natural consequence is, that they are rash, impetuous, boastful, and ambitious, ready to rush into contests with other nations about real or imaginary interests. Their institutions are calculated to prevent and remove causes of quarrel among themselves, but provide no adequate barriers to their encroachments on other nations. The extension of their territory may render their bonds of union too feeble to hold them together, and ambition may ruin a fabric which, under the guidance of morality and reason, might endure for ever. Their only chance of salvation lies in the success of their efforts to train and instruct a rising generation in virtue and knowledge. A cheering sign of improvement is presented in the superior works that are now prepared for the instruction of the people in the United States. "The School Library," published in Boston under the sanction and by authority of the Board of Education of the State of Massachusetts, contains volumes replete with instruction, and characterized by good taste. The State of New York, likewise, has established a fund for supplying schools with good libraries. Private individuals, also, are contributing important works to the education of the people. Among these, I have recently seen one that was much wanted, and is now admirably supplied by E. P. Hurlbut, Esq., namely, a work on "Civil Offices and Political Ethics." The "Ethics" are obviously founded on the new philosophy.

From the principles now laid down, it follows that the tendency of all governments, in modern times, is to become more democratic in proportion as the people become more intelligent and moral. Since 1831, our own government has been much more under

the influence of the people, than at any previous period of our history. Those who feel alarm at the march of democracy read history without the lights of philosophy. They have their minds filled with the barbarous democracies of Greece and Rome, and of the French Revolution, and tremble at the anticipated rule of an ignorant rabble in Britain. On the other hand, the only democracy which I anticipate, to be capable of gaining the ascendancy here, will be that of civilized and enlightened, of moral, and refined men; and if the principles which I have expounded be correct, that the higher sentiments and intellect are intended by Nature to govern, it will be morally impossible that while an enlightened and an ignorant class co-exist, as in Britain, the ignorant can rule. The British aristocracy, by neglecting their own education, may become relatively ignorant, in comparison with the middle classes, and their influence may then decay; but should this happen, it would still be an example of the intelligence of the country bearing the chief sway. In France, the dominion of the ferocious democrats was short-lived: the superior class gradually recovered their authority, and the reign of terror never was restored. In the ancient democracies, there was no enlightened class comparable with that of Britain. I regard, therefore, the fears of those who apprehend that the still ignorant and rude masses of our country will gain political power, and introduce anarchy, as equally unfounded with the terror that the rivers will some day flow upwards, and spread the waters of the ocean over the valleys and the mountains. The laws of the moral are as stable as those of the physical world; both may be shaken for a time by storms or convulsions, but the great elements of order remain for ever untouched, and after the clearing of the atmosphere they are seen in all their original symmetry and beauty. The result which I anticipate is, that education, religion, and the knowledge of the natural laws, will in time extend over all classes of the community, till the conviction shall become general, that the Creator has rendered all our interests and enjoyments compatible: and that then all classes will voluntarily abandon exclusive privileges, unjust pretensions to superiority, and the love of selfish dominion,—and establish a social condition in which homage will be paid only to virtue, knowledge, and utility, and in which a pure Christian equality, in so far as human nature is capable of realizing it, embodying the principle of doing to others as we would wish others to do unto us, will universally prevail. These days may be very distant; but causes leading to their approach appear to me to exist, and to be already in operation; and I hope that, in giving expression to these anticipations, I am stating the deductions of a sound philosophy, and not uttering the mere inspirations of a warm imagination. At all events, this theory, which places independence, freedom, public prosperity, and individual happiness, on the basis of religion, morality, and intelligence, is ennobling in itself, and cannot possibly do harm. Indeed, it can scarcely disappoint us; because, however far mankind may stop short of the results which I have anticipated, and for the realization of which I allow centuries of time, it is certain that every step which they shall advance in this career will lead them nearer to happiness, while by *no other path* can they attain to permanent prosperity and power.

LECTURE XVIII.

RELIGIOUS DUTIES OF MAN.

Consideration of man's duties to God, so far as discoverable by the light of nature—Natural theology a branch of natural philosophy—Not superseded by revelation—Brown, Stewart, and Chalmers quoted—Natural theology a guide to the sound interpretation of Scripture—Foundation of natural religion in the faculties of man—Distinction between morals and religion—The Bible does not create the religious feelings, but is fitted only to enlighten, enliven, and direct them—Illustration of this view—Stability of religion, even amid the downfall of churches and creeds—Moral and religious duties prescribed to man by natural theology—Prevalent erroneous views of divine worship—Natural evidence of God's existence and attributes—Man's ignorance the cause of the past barrenness and obscurity of natural religion—Importance of the Book of Creation as a revelation of the Divine Will.

Having discussed the foundation of moral philosophy, the duties of man as an individual and as a social being, and also the causes of the independence and freedom of nations, with the relations of the different forms of government to the moral and intellectual conditions of the people, I proceed to consider man's duty to God, so far as this can be discovered by the light of nature.

Lord Brougham, in his "Discourse of Natural Theology," maintains, with great truth, that natural theology is a branch of natural philosophy. His argument is the following: It is a truth of physics, that vision is performed by the eye refracting light, and making it converge to a focus upon the retina. The eye is an optical instrument, which, by the peculiar combination of its lenses, and the different materials they are composed of, produces vision. Design and adaptation are clearly manifested in its construction. These are truths in natural philosophy; but a single step converts them into evidences in natural theology. The eye must have been formed by a Being possessing knowledge of the properties of light, and of the matter of which the eye is composed: that Being is no inhabitant of earth: He is superior to man: He is his Maker: He is God. Thus, the first branch of natural theology, or that which treats of the existence and power of the Deity, rests on the same basis with physical science; in fact, it is a direct induction from the truths of science.

The second branch of natural theology treats of the duties of man towards God, and of the probable designs of the Deity in regard to his creatures. The facts of mental philosophy stand in the same relation to this branch, that the facts in physical science stand in relation to the first branch. By contemplating each mental faculty, the objects to which it is related by its constitution, its sphere of action, its uses and abuses, we may draw conclusions regarding the divine intentions in creating our faculties, and touching the duty which we owe to God in the employment of them. It is obvious, that as God has given us understanding* able to discriminate the uses and abuses of our faculties; and moral sentiments, leading us to prefer their use; we owe it to Him as a duty to fulfil his intentions, thus obviously expressed in our creation, by using our powers aright, and not abusing them.

The second branch of natural theology, like the first, rests upon the same foundation with all the other inductive sciences; the only difference being, that the one belongs chiefly to the inductive science of physics, and the other to the inductive science of mind.* This distinction, however, is not perfectly

accurate; because the evidence of the existence and attributes of God, and also of man's duty towards Him, may be found in both of these branches of science.

It has been objected, that revelation supersedes the necessity of studying natural theology. Dr Thomas Brown, in his Lectures on Moral Philosophy in the University of Edinburgh, has furnished a brief, but powerful, answer to this objection. "On this subject," says he,* "that comprehends the sublimest of all the truths which man is permitted to attain, the benefit of revelation may be considered to render every inquiry superfluous, that does not flow from it. But to those who are blessed with a clearer illumination, it cannot be uninteresting to trace the fainter lights, which, in the darkness of so many gloomy ages, amid the oppression of tyranny in various forms, and of superstition more afflicting than tyranny itself, could preserve, still dimly visible to man, that virtue which he was to love, and that Creator whom he was to adore. Nor can it be without profit, even to their better faith, to find all nature thus concurring, as to its most important truths, with revelation itself; and every thing, living and inanimate, announcing that high and holy One, of whose perfections they have been privileged with a more splendid manifestation."

Dugald Stewart, in his Outlines of Moral Philosophy, also treats at considerable length of natural religion. "The study of philosophy," says he,† "in all its various branches, both natural and moral, affords at every step a new illustration that the design which we trace in creation indicates wisdom, and that it operates in conformity to one uniform plan, inasmuch that the truths of natural religion gain an accession of evidence from every addition that is made to the stock of human knowledge."

Dr Chalmers, in the fifth chapter of his Bridge-water Treatise, discusses "the special and subordinate adaptations of external nature to the moral constitution of man," and observes, "Notwithstanding the blight which has so obviously passed over the moral world, and defaced many of its original lineaments, while it has left the materialism of creation, the loveliness of its scenes and landscapes, in a great measure untouched—still we possess very much the same materials for a Natural Theology, in reasoning on the element of virtue as in reasoning on the element of beauty." (P. 191.)

Farther—I consider the study of natural theology as important in leading to a sound interpretation of Scripture itself. Great differences exist in the interpretations of its declarations by different sects; and, as all truth must be harmonious, it appears to me that whenever the constitution of man and the attributes of the Deity shall be ascertained, so far as this is possible, by strictly logical inductions from facts correctly observed in nature, all interpretations of Scripture touching these points must be brought into harmony with nature, otherwise they will justly be regarded as erroneous. Every well established doctrine in moral philosophy and in natural theology, founded on the constitution of nature, will be a plumb-line by which to adjust interpretations of Scripture. The scriptural doctrine of the corruption of human nature, for example, is one on which a vast variety of opinions is entertained by Christians. Phenology shows that every faculty has received from the Creator an organ, and been furnished with legitimate objects, although each of them has also a wide sphere in which it may commit abuses. As the evidence of the organs is physical and indestructible, the views correctly deduced from it, must in time extinguish all interpretations of Scripture that are at variance with them. When Scripture is inter-

* See Lord Brougham's *Discourses*, 3d edit., p. 58. His argument is not clear.

preted in such a manner as to contradict the sound conclusions of reason on subjects which lie within the legitimate province of reason, such interpretations must be powerless, or positively mischievous. The Christian world, at present (1846), appears to be in a state of transition. In Germany, a large portion of the people, under the guidance of Johannes Ronge, have thrown off Roman Catholicism, also rejected the dogmas of the Protestant churches established at the Reformation, and adopted Rationalistic interpretations of Scripture. As a contrast to this movement, a number of the scholars of Oxford, under the influence of Dr Pusey, have gone over to the Church of Rome; while the middle classes in Scotland have abandoned their ancient Presbyterian Church, reared a new one on the same foundation, and embraced with fresh fervour the doctrines and opinions of the sixteenth century, rejected by the Germans. In these evolutions, no appeal has been made to the lights afforded by the New Philosophy; but as the sound dictates of reason are the revelations of God's attributes and will to the human understanding, through the medium of our natural constitution and that of external nature, they cannot be neglected with impunity by any class of teachers; and the day is on the wing when this philosophy will purify and control every Christian creed.

It is gratifying to trace the recognition of this principle in the works of divines. The Rev. Baden Powell, Savilian Professor of Geometry in the University of Oxford, in his work on "the Connexion of Natural and Divine Truth," says, "Physical science is the necessary foundation of natural theology: certain of the truths it discloses are warnings against mistaking the purport of Scripture; and the right use of the caution thus inculcated applies widely in the interpretation of revelation. Inductive philosophy is subservient both to natural and revealed religion. The investigation of God's works is an essential introduction to the right reception of his Word."

In like manner, there should be no philosophy that is not religious;—that is to say, which should not be viewed as a chapter of the Creator's great book of revelation, addressed to the human understanding in the constitution of the universe.

I proceed, therefore, to consider the subject of natural theology, without fearing that, if properly conducted, it will endanger any other class of truths.

The first point which I propose to investigate relates to the foundation of natural religion. I beg of you to observe that religion emanates from sentiments or emotions, and that it does not consist of a collection of mere intellectual conceptions or ideas. The foundations of it lie in the organs of Veneration, Wonder, and Hope. A brief explanation will enable you to understand this view. War springs originally not from the human intellect, but from the propensities of Combateness and Destructiveness, which give an instinctive tendency to oppose, to contend and to destroy. There are legitimate spheres within which these propensities may act beneficially; but when they are too energetic, they carry captive the other powers, enlist them in their service, and then lead to the extensive destruction and horrors of war (Combateness and Destructiveness, operating in a savage man with very little intellect, produce war in which ambush and cunning, clubs and bows and arrows, are used as the means of assault. The same propensities, acting in the nations of modern Europe, lead to the employment of scientific principles in the construction of works of attack and of defence and to the use of cannon, and other ingenious and complicated instruments of destruction. Still, Combateness and Destructiveness are the original sources in the human mind from which war itself, in all its

forms and with all its weapons, flows. If these instincts were not possessed, men would feel no impulse to fight, any more than they feel an impulse to fly. In like manner, the whole art of music rests on the organs of Tune and Time as its foundation. In some individuals, these organs are extremely defective; and they not only feel no internal impulse prompting them to produce melody, but are insensible to its charms when produced by others. In other persons, again, these organs act with such energy, that they impel them, as it were, to elicit music from every object. You may have seen individuals, who, in want of a better instrument, have beat out passable tunes by a succession of blows on their chins. When the musical organs engage the intellectual faculties to assist them, they obtain, by their aid, instruments for producing music, refined and perfect in proportion to the degree in which the intellect is instructed in the various arts and sciences capable of being applied to the production of such instruments. Still, you perceive that the origin or foundation of the whole art and practice of music lies in the organs of Tune and Time.

Farther—You can readily infer that war will be practised by any nation very much in the proportion which Combateness and Destructiveness bear in them to the other faculties. If these propensities preponderate over the moral sentiments, the people will be constantly craving for war, and seeking occasions for quarrels. If they be very feeble, public attention will be directed to other, and more peaceful pursuits, and contentions will, as far as possible, be avoided. If we wish to tame a warlike people to the arts of peace, we must try to stimulate their higher faculties, and to remove all objects calculated to excite their pugnacious propensities. The same remarks apply to music. A native love of music will prevail in any people, in proportion to the natural endowment of the organs of Tune and Time in their brains. If we wish to cultivate music in a people, we must address the organs of Tune and Time by the sweetest and most touching melodies, and thereby call them gently and agreeably into action; because by exercising them, and by no other means, can we increase their energy, and augment that people's love of music.

Similar observations apply to religion. The foundations of religion lie in the organ of Veneration, which instinctively feels emotions of reverence and respect;—in the organ of Wonder, which longs after the new, the astonishing, and the supernatural, and which, combined with Veneration, leads us to adore an unseen power;—and in the organ of Hope, which instinctively looks forward in expectation to future enjoyment. These inspire man with a ceaseless desire to offer homage to a superior Being, to adore him, and to seek his protection. The inherent activity of these organs has prompted men in all ages to employ their intellectual faculties to discover as many facts as possible concerning the existence and attributes of superior powers, or gods, and to institute ceremonies for their gratification. In some tribes of savages, we are informed that no traces of religion have been discovered; but you will find that in them the organs which I have named are extremely small. They are in the same condition in regard to the religious feelings, that other tribes, in whom the organs of Tune and Time are deficient, stand in regard to melody; these have no music, in consequence of the extreme feebleness of the related organs in their brains. On the other hand, wherever the organs of the religious sentiments are large in a people, that nation or tribe will be found to be proportionally devoted to religion. If their intellectual faculties be feeble, if they have no science and no true revelation to direct them, they may be

engulfed in superstition; but superstition is only the religious sentiments gone astray. They may be found worshipping stocks and stones, reptiles, and idols of the most revolting description; but still, this shows not only that the tendency to worship exists in them, but that it may be manifested in great vigour when the intellect is feeble or very imperfectly informed. It proves also that these sentiments are in themselves blind or mere general impulses, which will inevitably err, unless directed by an illumination superior to their own.

The religious sentiments may act in combination with the propensities, or with the moral sentiments. In combination with the lower feelings, they produce a cold, cruel, and selfish faith, in which the votary's chief object is to secure the favour of Heaven for himself; while he allots endless and nearly universal misery to the rest of mankind. In combination with Benevolence and Conscientiousness, they lead to a faith in which justice and mercy, truth and humility, prevail.

There is a distinction in nature between morals and religion. The organs of Conscientiousness and Benevolence are the foundations of morals. When they are predominantly large, they produce the tendency to do justly, and to act kindly, towards all men; but if the organs of the religious sentiments be deficient, there will not be an equal tendency to worship. Thus, we meet with many men who are moral, but not religious. In like manner, if the organs of the religious sentiments be large, and those of Conscientiousness and Benevolence be deficient, there may be a strong tendency to perform acts of religious devotion, with a great disregard of the duties of brotherly love and honesty. We meet with such characters in the world. The late Sir Henry Moncreiff, minister of St Cuthbert's Parish in Edinburgh, is said to have described a person with whom he had had many transactions, in these forcible terms: "He is a clever man, a kind-hearted man, and he seems to be a religious man,—in short, an excellent man; only, somehow or other, he is sadly deficient in common honesty." Phenology enables us to comprehend the combination of qualities which gives rise to such characters. The description indicates large intellect, large organs of the religious sentiments, and large Benevolence, but great deficiency in the organs of Conscientiousness.

According to these views, religion rests on the sentiments of Veneration, Wonder, and Hope, as its foundations. The enlightenment of the intellect serves to direct these sentiments to their proper objects, but does not produce them, and therefore does not produce religion. It is thus impossible that religion itself can be overset or eradicated from the human mind. The forms and ceremonies by which the religious sentiments manifest themselves may be expected to vary in different ages, and in different countries, according to the degree of development of the religious, moral, and intellectual organs, and the state of the intellectual cultivation of the people; but these emotions themselves evidently glow with a never-dying flame, and man will cease to adore only when he ceases to exist.

After you understand that music springs from the organs of Time and Tune, you would smile if I were to assure you that it would perish if the Society of Professional Musicians were dissolved. You would at once discover that this society itself, as well as all the pieces which its members perform, and the instruments which they use, have sprung from the innate love of music in the mind; and that it is mistaking the effect for the cause, to imagine, that when they cease to exist as a society, music will become extinct. The result of their dissolution would be, that the inherent activity of the musical faculties would prompt

other individuals to establish other societies, probably on more improved principles; and music would flourish still.

It is equally absurd to mistake churches, articles of faith, and acts of parliament, for the foundations of religion, and to imagine, that, when these are changed, religion will perish. The day was, when religion was universally believed to rest, for its existence, solely on the decrees of Roman Catholic councils and popish bulls, and when the priests assured the world that the moment their church and authority were subverted, religion would be for ever destroyed. But we have lived to see religion flourishing vigorously in nations which disown that authority and church. If the churches and articles of faith now prevalent shall be changed, of which there is much probability, the adherents of them will, after the fashion of the priests of Rome, proclaim that the doom of religion has been sealed; but all men who are capable of looking at the true foundation of religious worship, firmly and deeply laid in the human faculties, will be unmoved by such alarms. They will expect religion to shine forth in ever-brightening loveliness and splendour, in proportion to the enlightenment of the public mind; and they will fear neither infernal nor terrestrial foes.

It would greatly assist the progress of improvement, if a firm conviction could be carried home to the public mind, that religion has its foundations in the nature of man, because many excellent persons might thereby be delivered from the blind terrors in which they constantly live, lest it should be destroyed; and the acrimony of contending sects also, every one of which identifies its own triumph with that of religion itself, might probably be moderated.

The next question that presents itself is, Whether there be any moral or religious duties prescribed to man by natural theology? In answering this question, moralists in general proceed to prove the existence and attributes of God, and to infer from them the duties which we owe to Him as our creator, preserver, and governor. They regard Him as the mighty God, and us as His lowly subjects, bound to fear, tremble, love, and obey Him: I entirely concur in this view when applied to *doing the will of God*; but it appears to me that it has often led to misconceptions and abuse. Religious duty has, somehow or other, come to be too generally regarded (in the spirit at least in which it is practised, if not in words) as a homage rendered to the Divine Being for his own gratification, the neglect of which he will punish, and the performance of which he will reward. Many persons have a notion of the Divine Being somewhat resembling that of an earthly sovereign, whom they may win and gratify by praises and flattery, and from whose favour they may expect to receive something agreeable and advantageous in return. All this is superstition and error, and it partakes too much of the character of selfishness. I am aware that no rational Christian puts his religious faith and worship into the form of such propositions; but I fear that the spirit of them can be too often detected in much of the religion of the world.

It appears to me that the religious service of the Deity possesses, under the lights of nature, a totally different character.

The existence of a supreme Ruler of the world, is no doubt the first position to be established in natural religion: but the proofs of it are so abundant, so overpowering to the understanding, and so captivating to the sentiments, that I regard this as the simplest, the easiest, and the least likely to be disputed, of all the branches of the subject. If reflecting intellect be possessed, we can scarcely move a step in the investigation of nature without receiving irresistible proofs of divine agency and wisdom. I opened the

first book embracing natural science, that came to my hand, when composing this lecture. It happened to be a Number of the Penny Cyclopædia, which had just been sent in by the bookseller; and I turned up the first page that presented itself (p. 151). It chanced to be one on Bees, and I read as follows: "In many instances, it is only by the bees travelling from flower to flower, that the pollen or farina is carried from the male to the female flowers, without which, they would not fructify. One species of bee would not be sufficient to fructify all the various sorts of flowers, were the bees of that species ever so numerous, for it requires species of different sizes and different constructions." M. Sprengel found that, "not only are insects indispensable in fructifying different species of Iris, but that some of them, as *I. Xiphium*, require the agency of the larger humble bees, which alone are strong enough to force their way between the stile-flags; and hence, as these insects are not so common as many others, this Iris is often barren, or bears imperfect seeds."

This simple announcement proves to my understanding, incontestably, the existence and presence of a Deity in creation; because we see here an important end, clearly involving design, accomplished by agents altogether unconscious of the service in which they are engaged. The bee, performing, all unconsciously to itself, the work of fructification of the flowers,—and the provision of bees of different weights for stile-flags of different strengths,—bespeak, in language irresistible, the mind and workmanship of an intelligent contriver. And who is this contriver? It is not man. There is only one answer possible,—it is the Deity; and one object of his selecting such a method for operating, may perhaps have been, to speak home to the understandings of men, concerning his own presence, power, and wisdom. Nature is absolutely overflowing with similar examples.

But there is another species of proof of the existence of a God,—that which is addressed to the poetic sentiments of man. "The external world," says Mr Sedgwick, "proves to us the being of a God, in two ways: by addressing the imagination, as well as by informing the reason. It speaks to our imaginative and poetic feelings, and they are as much a part of ourselves as our limbs and our organs of sense. Music has no charms for the deaf, nor has painting for the blind; and all the touching sentiments and splendid imagery borrowed by the poet from the world without, would lose their magic power, and might as well be presented to a cold statue as to a man, were there no pre-ordained harmony between his mind and the material beings around him. It is certain that the glories of the external world are so fitted to our imaginative powers as to give them a perception of the Godhead and a glimpse of his attributes; and this adaptation is a proof of the existence of God, of the same kind (but of greater or less power, according to the constitution of our individual minds) with that which we derive from the adaptation of our senses to the constitution of the material world." Discourse on the studies of the University of Cambridge, pp. 20, 21.

Assuming, then, the existence of a Deity as demonstrable by means of the work of creation, the next question is, What can we discover of his character, by the exercise of our natural faculties?

In answering this question, I observe, in the first place, that we cannot possibly discover any thing from creation concerning his person, or personal history, if I may use such expressions, because there is no manifestation of these in the external world. If, for example, we were to present a thread of raw silk to an intelligent man, and ask him to discover from its physical appearances alone, the individual characteristics of the maker of the thread, he would tell us

that it is impossible to do so, because the object presented to him does not contain one element from which his understanding can legitimately infer a single fact in answer to such a question. In like manner, when we survey earth, air, and ocean, our own minds and bodies, and every page of creation that is open to us, although we perceive thousands of indications of the mental qualities of the Creator, we receive not one ray of light concerning his form of being, his personal history, residence, or individual nature. All conjectures on this subject, therefore, are the offspring of fancy or of superstition.

But we receive from creation overwhelming proofs of his mental attributes. In the stupendous mechanism of the heavens, in which our sun and whole planetary system are but as one wheel, and that so small, that although annihilated, its absence would scarcely be perceptible to an eye embracing the universe,—we perceive indications of power which absolutely overwhelm our imaginations. In the arrangements of physical and animal creation, we discover proofs of wisdom without limits; and in the endowment of our own minds, and the adaptation of the external world to them, we discover evidence of unbounded goodness, intelligence, and justice.

The inference which I draw from these manifestations of the divine character is this: that God vells from us his individual or personal nature, to avert from our minds every conception that he stands in need of us, or of our homage or services, for *his own sake*; so that we may have neither temptation nor apology for adopting a system of worship, such as we should address to a being whom we desired to flatter or please by our attentions;—and that he reveals to us his moral and intellectual attributes, to intimate to us that the worship which will meet with his approbation, is that which will best carry into execution His will in that department of creation which is placed under the dominion of man as a rational and responsible being. Now, what is this form of service? All creation proclaims an answer! It is acting in the spirit of the Deity, as manifested in his works. If so, natural religion must be *progressive* in its principles and duties, in correspondence with our increasing knowledge of the will of the Divine Being, expressed in his works; and it really is so.

Theologians often reproach the religion of nature with darkness and uncertainty. They might as legitimately make the same charge against the *science and philosophy* of nature. Up to a very recent period, indeed, the science of nature was barren; but the reason was, not that in itself it contained no wisdom, nor any elements adapted to the profitable use of man, but that man's ignorance was so great; that he had not discovered how to study that science in its right spirit. As soon as Lord Bacon put him into the road to study it wisely, natural philosophy became munificently productive; and at this hour its stores continue to yield more and more abundant benefits to man, in proportion as they are opened up.

The same history will hereafter be given of natural religion. While men were ignorant of every principle of science, it was most natural in them to ascribe every isolated effect to an isolated power, and to imagine as many deities as there were agencies in the world which they could not reconcile. They saw the river waters rolling in mighty torrents to the ocean;—their Veneration and Wonder were moved by the power displayed, and they imagined a river god as the cause. They perceived the earth yielding spontaneously fruits, and flowers, and herbage, of the richest kinds; they felt the bounty of the gifts, and ignorant of their cause, ascribed them to a goddess, Ceres. They saw the seasons change, and the sun, moon, and planets, present different appearances; and deeply impressed with them uni-

festations of power which these orbs displayed, but ignorant of the cause, they imagined them to be deities themselves. All this was the natural effect of the human faculties operating in profound ignorance of physical causation.

But since science demonstrated that the planets revolve, and rivers flow, in virtue of one law of gravitation, we no longer ascribe each action to a separate deity, but attribute both to one; and our notions of that one are prodigiously enhanced by the perception of a single power extending over such mighty intervals of space, and operating in all according to one uniform law. In proportion, therefore, as we advance in knowledge of creation, we discover proofs of uniformity, combination, mutual relationship, and adaptation, that compel the understanding to ascend to one cause, and to concentrate in that cause the most transcendent qualities. It is thus that our conceptions of the attributes of the Divine Being drawn from nature, go on increasing in truth, in magnificence, and in beauty, in proportion as we proceed in the acquisition of knowledge; and as our rapid progress in it is of recent origin, we may well believe that natural religion could not earlier have presented much instruction regarding the Deity to the understanding or the moral sentiments of man.

But the reproach is made against natural theology, that it is barren also in regard to man's duties. Here the same answer occurs. Natural theology teaches that it is man's duty to perform aright the part which God has allotted to him in creation; but how could he discover what that part was, until he became acquainted with himself and with creation? Natural theology was barren in regard to duties, only because the knowledge of nature, which alone gives it form and substance, had itself scarcely an existence in the human mind. Man had not learned to read the record, and was therefore ignorant of the precepts which it contained. He was exactly in the same condition, in regard to natural religion, in which most of us would be, if we had never received any but a Gaelic Bible. The whole doctrines and precepts of Christianity might be faithfully recorded, and most explicitly set down in it; but if we could not interpret the characters, of what service would the book be to us? It would be absurd, however, to object against the Bible itself, on this account, that it is barren of instruction.

In like manner, whenever we shall have interpreted aright the constitution of the human mind and body, the laws of the physical world, and our relations to it and to God, which constitute the record of our duties, inscribed by the Creator in the book of nature, we shall find natural theology most copious in its precepts, most express in its injunctions, and most preceptory in its demands of obedience. For example: When we know that He has bestowed on man an organ of Philoprogenitiveness, and enabled us to comprehend its uses and objects, every well-constituted mind feels that this gift implies a direct precept from God, that parents should love their children. But when we discover that this is a mere blind impulse, which may egregiously err, and that God has given us intellect and moral sentiments to direct its manifestations, the obligation is instantly recognized to lie on all parents, to use these faculties, in order to attain the knowledge necessary for loving their children according to true wisdom. And what is this knowledge? It is acquaintance with the bodily constitution and mental faculties of children, and with the influence of air, diet, exercise, seasons, clothing, mental instruction, and society, upon them; so that the parents may be enabled to train them in health, to prepare them for becoming virtuous members of society, and

to secure their present and future happiness. If any mother, through ignorance of the physical constitution of her child, shall so mismanage its treatment, that it shall become miserable, or die, she has neglected a great duty proscribed by natural theology; because the moment she perceives that God has rendered that knowledge necessary to the welfare of the child, and has given her understanding to acquire it, she is guilty of disobedience to his will in omitting to seek it. The unhappiness and death of the child and her own attendant suffering, are punishments which clearly indicate his displeasure.

I appeal to you who have followed a course of Lectures on Phrenology, and read the "Constitution of Man," and been satisfied with the general truth of the principles unfolded in them, whether you do not perceive these to be duties proscribed in the constitution of nature, by the Creator, to parents, with a command as clear and explicit, and with a sanction as certain, as if He had opened the heavens, and, amidst thunders and the shaking of the universe, delivered to them the same precepts written on monuments of brass! In truth, they are more so; because the authenticity of the tablets of brass, like those of stone, might be disputed and denied by sceptics, who did not themselves see them delivered; while the precepts written in our nature, adapted to the constitution of our faculties, and enforced by the whole order of creation, stand revealed in a record which never decays nor becomes obsolete, and the authenticity of which no sceptic can successfully deny. If the precepts therein contained be neglected by ignorance, or set at defiance by obstinacy, they never are so with impunity; because God in his providence sweeps resistlessly along in the course which he has revealed, laying in the grave the children in whose persons his organic laws have been deeply infringed, rendering unhappy those in whom they have been materially neglected, and rewarding with enjoyment only those in whose minds and bodies they have been obeyed.

Every organ of the body, and every faculty of the mind is a text from which the most valuable lessons in natural religion might be drawn; lessons thoroughly adapted to the human understanding, true, practical, and beneficial. Natural theology would at once impress on them the sanction of the Divinity, and enforce them, by shewing that He punishes men for their neglect, and rewards them for their observance, in the ordinary administration of his providence. If I am sound in the view which I have laboured to establish, that this world really constitutes a great theatre of causation, adapted to the animal, moral, and intellectual nature of man, so arranged as to admit of his becoming prosperous and happy in proportion as he becomes thoroughly intelligent and moral,—and by no other means;—what a fertile field of precept for the practice of virtue is thus opened up to us! How eloquent, how forcible, how varied, and how instructive, may not the teachers of God's law and God's will then become, when they shall have the whole book of creation opened to them for texts; when every line shall be clear, interesting, and instructive; and when they shall be able to demonstrate, in the consequences which attend the fulfilment or neglect of their precepts, that they are teaching no vain or fanciful theories, but the true wisdom of God! Conceive for one moment how much of useful, interesting, nay, captivating instruction, might be delivered to a general audience, by merely expounding the functions, uses, and abuses of the various organs of the body necessary to health, and of the organs and faculties of the mind, holding up the constitution of each as a Divine intimation to man, and the consequences of using or abusing each, as solemn precepts from the Divinity, addressed to his understanding and his moral and religious feelings!

In presenting these views for your acceptance, I assume that it is possible to discover important duties by studying the institutions of the Creator; and in the first Lecture, I stated that "it is accordance with the dictates of all the faculties harmoniously combined, which constitutes certain actions virtuous, and discordance with them which constitutes other actions vicious." An objection to this doctrine, however, has been stated in the following words:—"Here we would ask, whose 'enlightened intellect' is referred to in the above passage, or how we can know when our own becomes sufficiently enlightened to be taken as a guide! Is this giving us one moral standard, or many?" I would answer this question by propounding to the objector another. What moral standard does he himself possess? He will probably answer, "the Scriptures;" but I reply that the Scriptures are differently interpreted by different minds; and I again inquire, Whose mind constitutes the standard of infallible interpretation? The Pope answers, that the minds of himself and of his cardinals, acting in council, do so. The General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, however, deny the pretensions of the Pope and cardinals, and virtually claim it as belonging to themselves. The Episcopalians, Unitarians, and Universalists, on the other hand, affirm that the Church of Scotland has no more legitimate claim to infallibility in interpreting Scripture, than the Pope. Where, then, is the standard to be found? In my opinion, the decisions of those individuals who possess the largest development of the moral and intellectual organs, and the most favourable combination of them in relation to each other and to the organs of the animal propensities; who also possess the most active temperaments, and who have cultivated all these gifts to the highest advantage, will be entitled to the greatest respect as authorities on morals and religion, whether these be founded on interpretations of God's works, or on interpretations of Scripture. If this standard be imperfect, I know of no other.

Again—If these views be well founded, how unproductive of real advantage must the preaching and teaching of Christianity necessarily be, while the duties prescribed by Nature are ignorantly neglected! Nothing appears to be more preposterous, than for human beings to pray, evening and morning, to their Maker,—“Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven;” and all the while to close their eyes against perception of the means appointed by God for realizing his kingdom and doing his will on earth! So far from the duties prescribed by natural theology being either barren or adverse to Christianity, it appears to me that practical Christianity has remained, to a great extent, unproductive, misunderstood, and comparatively feeble, in consequence of the dictates of natural theology having been unknown and neglected. If I am correct in the single position, that men in whom the coronal region and the anterior lobe of the brain are large, are naturally alive to the truth and excellence of practical Christianity, while those in whom these regions, particularly the coronal, are deficient, are naturally opposed to, or indifferent about it,—how important does it become to obey all the dictates of natural theology for improving the development of the brain, as a preliminary condition, indispensable to the general introduction of the morality of Jesus Christ! The clerical teachers of mankind in all civilized countries are placed at present in a position which few of them understand. The theology which constitutes the distinctive creed of each sect is scholastic and dogmatical, resting on words and interpretations of words based on no natural foundation, and unconnected with any natural science. The discoveries which have been made since these creeds

were framed, in Astronomy, Geology, and Physiology, have brought facts concerning physical nature and the nature of man to light, which were never dreamt of by the authors of these formulas of belief, and which yet bear directly on their merits. A knowledge of these sciences is becoming widely diffused among the people, and the effects are already discernible in the United States of America, France, and Germany, where religious discussion is freely maintained. There the ancient formulas are every day falling more and more into disrepute; while no satisfactory substitute for them has yet been introduced. This cannot be achieved until the record of nature be honestly and fearlessly contrasted with that of Scripture, and justice done to both. When will the clergy open their eyes to this fact?

LECTURE XIX.

RELIGIOUS DUTIES OF MAN.

Natural Theology prolific in moral precepts—Its dictates compared with those of the Ten Commandments—Answer to the objection that Natural Theology excludes prayer—Dr Barrow, Dr Heylin, and Lord Kames quoted—Worship of the Deity rational.

In my last Lecture, I mentioned that natural religion is based on the sentiments of Veneration, Wonder, and Hope, which are innate in man, and which give him the desire to discover, and the disposition to worship and obey, a supernatural Power; that it is the duty of the intellect to direct these sentiments to their proper objects; and that the intellect obtains much needful illumination from the study of Nature. I regarded the province of reason to be to unfold the character and will of God, in so far as these are discoverable in the works of creation. I observed, that, on this account, natural theology must always keep pace with natural science; science being merely a methodical unfolding of what God has done and instituted in creation. Hence I inferred that our notions of the character of God will be more correct and sublime, in proportion as we become better acquainted with his works; and that our perception of our duties will be clearer and more forcible, in proportion as we compare correctly our own constitution with his other natural institutions. I concluded the last Lecture by observing that natural theology is in reality extremely prolific in precepts, and imperative in enforcing obedience, whenever we know how to read the record. In elucidation of this remark, I shall now compare the Ten Commandments with the dictates of natural theology, and you shall judge for yourselves whether the same law is not promulgated in both. In order to see the precept, however, in natural theology, be it remembered that you must be able to read the record in which it is written; that is to say, you must understand the constitution of the external world, and that of your own nature, to such an extent as to be capable of perceiving what God intimates that a rational being, capable of comprehending both, should do, and abstain from doing, in consequence of that constitution. If you are ignorant of this natural record, then the duties which it contains will appear to you to be mere fancies, or gratuitous assumptions; and the observations which I am about to make will probably seem unfounded, if not irreverent. But with every indulgence for the ignorance of natural institutions, in which the imperfections of our education have left most of our minds, I beg to be forgiven for not bowing before the decisions of that ignorance, but to be permitted to appeal to the judgment of men possessing the most extended knowledge. If there be individuals here

who have seriously studied natural science, and also the structure and functions of the human body, and the nature and functions of the mind, as revealed by Phrenology, they have learned to read the record of natural theology, and have prepared their minds by knowledge to interpret it aright; and to them I address the following observations.

The Ten Commandments are given forth in the Book of Exodus, which narrates that they were delivered by God himself to Moses, written on tables of stone. If we find that every one of them is written clearly and indelibly also in the human constitution, and is enjoined by natural religion, this must strengthen the authority of Scripture, by shewing that nature harmonizes with its dictates.

The first commandment is—"Thou shalt have no other gods before me."

This forbids an abuse of Veneration; and all nature, when rightly understood, proclaims one God, and enforces the same commandment. The nations who are lost in superstition and given up to idolatry, are profoundly ignorant of natural science. In proportion as we become acquainted with nature, the harmony of design and unity of power displayed in the most distant portions of the universe, proclaim more and more forcibly the unity of the Designing Mind; and hence the authority of this commandment becomes stronger and stronger as science and natural religion advance in their conquests.

The second—"Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them nor serve them," &c.

This is a repetition or amplification of the same precept.

Third—"Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain."

This is still directed against an abuse of Veneration. As soon as the intellect is enlightened by natural religion, in regard to the real attributes of the Deity,—reverence and obedience to him, as prescribed by these commandments, are irresistibly felt to be right, and conformable to the dictates of the natural law; while all irreverence and profanity are as clearly indicated to be wrong.

Fourth—"Remember the Sabbath-day, to keep it holy," &c.—"In it thou shalt not do any work," &c.

This enjoins giving rest to the muscular frame on the seventh day, that the brain may be able to manifest the moral and intellectual faculties with more complete success. It ordains also, that on that day the moral and intellectual faculties shall be exclusively devoted to the study and contemplation of God and his works, and to the doing of his will.

Every line of our bodily and mental constitution coincides with this precept. Phrenology, which is a branch of natural philosophy, shews that the mind depends for its powers of acting on the state of the brain, and that if constant muscular labour be endured, the brain will be inert, and all our moral, religious, and intellectual faculties will become obtuse and dull;—on the other hand, that if we indulge in ceaseless mental exertion, we shall exhaust and weary out our brains by over-activity, and become at length incapable of beneficial application to moral and religious duties. Thus the obligation to rest in due season, is written as clearly in our constitution as in the Fourth Commandment.

Indeed, our natural constitution commands not only an extent of repose from labour equal to that prescribed by the commandment, but greatly more. It imposes on us the duty of resting from labour several hours every day in our lives, and dedicating them to the study and practice of the will of God. The observance, however, which it prescribes of the seventh day, is somewhat different from that taught by human interpreters of the Fourth Commandment. On this subject, the New Testament is silent, so that

the mode of observing Sunday is left to the discretion of men. Our Scottish divines, in general, forbid walking or riding, or any other form of exercise and recreation on Sundays, as a contravention of the Fourth Commandment. In our constitution, on the other hand, God proclaims that while incessant labour, through its influence on the mental organs, blunts our moral, intellectual, and religious faculties, abstinence from all bodily exertion, and the practice of incessant mental application for one entire day, even on religion, are also injurious to the welfare of both body and mind; and that on the seventh day, there is no exception to the laws which regulate our functions on other days. These require that air, exercise, and mental relaxation should alternate with moral, religious, and intellectual studies. Accordingly, natural theology teaches us to transfer a portion of the Sunday's rest and holiness to every one of the other days of the week, and to permit on the Sundays as much of air, exercise, and recreation, as will preserve the mental organs in the best condition for performing their moral, religious, and intellectual duties.

In the New Testament, no express injunction is laid on Christians to observe the first day of the week in the same manner that the Jews were commanded in the Old Testament to observe the last day of the week, or Sabbath. In point of fact, there is no explicit prescription in the New Testament of any particular mode of observing the first day of the week. While, therefore, all Christian nations have agreed in considering themselves not bound by the Fourth Commandment to observe the seventh day, or Jewish Sabbath, they have differed in regard to the mode of observing the first day of the week; and, as the Scripture prescribes no definite rule, each nation has adopted such forms of observance as appeared to itself to be most accordant with the general spirit of Christianity. Thus, in Catholic countries, amusements are permitted on Sundays after divine service; in Scotland, amusements and labour, except works of necessity and mercy, are prohibited. In Scotland, also, Sunday commences at twelve o'clock on Saturday night, and ends at twelve o'clock on Sunday night. In Massachusetts, on the other hand, different views are entertained. While Chap. 50, Sects. 1st, 2d, and 3d, of the Revised Statutes, prohibits all persons from doing any work, and from travelling on "the Lord's day," Sect. 4th declares that day, for the purposes of these sections, "to include the time between the midnight preceding and the sun-setting of the said day." According to the Scottish law, therefore, Sunday consists of twenty-four hours, at all seasons of the year; while according to the "Revised Statutes of Massachusetts" it consists only of sixteen and a half hours on the 22d of December, and stretches out as the days lengthen, but never exceeds nineteen and a half hours at any period. Hence, in Scotland, a person would be fined or imprisoned for doing acts after sunset, on the Sunday evening, which in Massachusetts are entirely lawful. Again, in the Revised Statutes of this commonwealth, it is declared, by Sect. 5, that no person shall be present at any game, sport, play, or public diversion, except concerts of sacred music, upon the evening next preceding or following the Lord's day," under the penalty of paying a fine of five dollars. In Edinburgh, the best plays and public entertainments are brought forth on the "evening next preceding the Lord's day," or Saturday evening,—and are then most numerously attended; so that in Boston a Christian is fined in five dollars, for doing, on that evening, what Christian in Edinburgh is permitted to do without any penalty whatever. This shews how far each of these states assumes the power to itself of determin-

ing what may and may not be done on the first day of the week; a clear indication that no positive rule is laid down in Scripture for the guidance of all nations.

On the continent of Europe, both Roman Catholics and Protestants devote a considerable portion of Sunday to recreation. This may be carried, in some instances, too far; but unless the Scriptures abrogate the law written by God in our constitution, we in Scotland have erred in the opposite extreme. The force of this observation can be appreciated only by those who are acquainted with the physiology of the brain. The difference between the expounder of the Bible and him who unfolds the natural laws, is this: The former, when he departs from the natural laws, can enforce his interpretations of Scripture only by an arm of flesh. If men refuse to forego air, exercise, and recreation on the seventh day, the priest may refuse them church privileges, or call in the police to fine and imprison them; but he can do no more. He cannot change the nature of the mind and body; nor will the Creator punish the people for not acting as their teacher desires them, in opposition to the natural laws. The interpreter of the Book of Nature, on the other hand, may wield no arm of flesh; but he is enabled to point to the power of God enforcing the divine laws, and to demonstrate that punishment is inseparably connected with infringement, and reward with obedience. The expounder of Scripture, who, without inquiring what God has commanded in his natural laws, goes to Parliament, and prays for authority to enforce his own interpretation of the Fourth Commandment on his country, is met by opposition, ridicule, and aversion; *—he is astonished at what he regards as the perverse and irreligious character of legislators, and ascribes their conduct to the corruption of human nature. It is the arm of the Deity that opposes him. His scheme, in so far as it prohibits wholesome recreation, is in opposition to the divine laws written in the nature of man nature speaks with a thousand tongues; and his object is baffled by a might which he neither sees nor comprehends.

This appears to me to be the real cause of the bad success in parliament of the Sabbath-observance bills. They clearly conform to nature in so far as they prohibit compulsory labour on that day; but they certainly depart from the laws written by God in our constitution, when they tend to discourage and prohibit that extent of recreation on Sundays, which a corporeal frame like ours demands, and without which the mind, while dependent on the brain for its energy, cannot put forth its full vigour either in morals, religion, or science. I fear that these ideas may appear startling to some of my present audience, who have not studied the connection of the brain with the mind; but believing them to be correct in interpretations of the divine will, I should feel myself guilty of moral cowardice, if I forbore to bring them under your notice.

When, on the other hand, the expounder of Scripture interprets according to God's law as revealed in nature, he is backed and supported by the whole weight of the Divine power and authority in creation, and his precepts become irresistible. He needs no act of parliament and no police to enforce his edicts. The Lord of heaven and earth, who proclaimed the law, carries it into execution.

The Fifth Commandment is—"Honour thy father and thy mother," &c.

This enjoins an exercise of Veneration towards pa-

rents. Natural theology enforces this precept in the most direct and efficacious manner. There is an organ of Veneration prompting us to respect virtue, wisdom, and experience, and our parents are among its natural objects. There is, however, one modification of it which natural theology points out, not expressed, although implied, in the Fifth Commandment:—Parents must render themselves legitimate objects of veneration, by manifesting superior moral, intellectual, and religious qualities and attainments, before they are authorized to expect the sentiment to be directed towards them by their offspring. Both Scripture and reason require them to do so, and they have no warrant from either to exact reverence while they neglect their own duties.

The Sixth Commandment is—"Thou shalt not kill."

This forbids an abuse of Destructiveness. In natural theology we find that the dictates of Benevolence, Veneration, and Conscientiousness, all conspire with the commandment in forbidding violence; and moreover Combativeness and Destructiveness lend their aid in enforcing the precept, because they prompt society to retaliate and slay the killer.

The Seventh Commandment is—"Thou shalt not commit adultery."

This forbids an abuse of Amativeness. In natural theology, the whole moral sentiments conjoin in the same prohibition; and they and the intellect carry the restrictions and directions greatly farther. They prohibit marriages at ages too early and too late; marriages of persons related in blood; of persons who possess imperfect or immoral developments of brain; of individuals while labouring under any great constitutional malady. In short, natural theology interdicts many abuses of Amativeness not mentioned either in the Old or New Testament, and it shows its authority in the natural laws for its requirements. The disregard with which the dictates of natural theology in this department are treated, is to be traced to profound ignorance that God has issued the prohibitions. We are not yet accustomed to regard nature as a revelation of God's will, or to direct our conduct by it; but this is either our fault or our misfortune, and it is wrong.

The Eighth Commandment is—"Thou shalt not steal."

This forbids an abuse of Acquisitiveness. In natural theology, Conscientiousness and the other moral sentiments concur in the denunciation of theft, and the intellect points out to the culprit that the individuals who are the subjects of his depredations, will visit him with a treatment which must prove painful to himself.

The Ninth Commandment is—"Thou shalt not bear false witness."

This forbids the action of the other faculties without the control of Conscientiousness; all the moral sentiments proclaim the same prohibition.

The Tenth Commandment is—"Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's house," &c.

This forbids an abuse of Acquisitiveness, combined with Self-Esteem, in the form of self-love, seeking gratification at the expense of others. Conscientiousness and Benevolence are directly opposed to such abuses, and condemn them.

Thus the precepts contained in the Ten Commandments are enforced in natural theology by the dictates of the whole moral sentiments, and also by the arrangements of the physical and moral worlds, which bring evil on those who contravene them.

Trying these commandments, then, by the standards of natural theology, we see no reason to question their inherently Divine character; for we find them all written in the natural record of the Divine will. I may observe, however, that they are not complete: As rules of duty; Firstly—they do not

* At the time the text was written, Sir Andrew Agnew was beseeching Parliament to pass a bill for the better observance of the Sabbath.

forbid, in express terms, abuses of Philoprogenitiveness, Adhesiveness, Self-Esteem, Love of Approbation, Benevolence, and many other faculties; and, secondly, they do not expressly enjoin the *direct exercise* of any faculty except that of Veneration. There is no commandment prescribing as a duty the exercise of Benevolence, Conscientiousness, and Intellect, or enforcing legitimate uses of Philoprogenitiveness, Adhesiveness, Cautiousness, &c. The New Testament far excels the Mosaic law in supplying these deficiencies. First, Christ forbids the abuses of *all* our faculties; secondly, he enjoins the active and legitimate *exercise* of all of them; and, thirdly, he clearly proclaims the supremacy of the moral sentiments, or teaches the duty of loving our neighbours as ourselves; and natural theology coincides with, and enforces his commands. Want of time prevents me from shewing this in detail, but you can have no difficulty yourselves in following out the subject with the lights which you now possess.

It has been stated as an insuperable objection to these views, that they entirely exclude the practice of prayer, praise, and devotion. If God govern by general and immutable laws, what, it is asked, is the object or advantage of offering him any homage or service whatever? I answer this question in the words of Dr Isaac Barrow: "We do not pray to instruct or advise God; not to tell him news or inform him of our wants (he knows them, as our Saviour telleth us, before we ask): nor do we pray by dint of argument to persuade God, and bring him to our bent; nor that by fair speech we may cajole him or move his affections towards us by pathetic oration: not for any such purpose are we obliged to pray. But for that it becometh and behoveth us to do, because it is a proper instrument of bettering, ennobling, and perfecting our souls; because it breedeth most holy affections, and pure satisfactions, and worthy resolutions; because it fitteth us for the enjoyment of happiness, and leadeth us thither: for such ends devotion is prescribed."* The doctrine that God is immutable, that he governs by general laws, and that our prayers have no effect on him, has been maintained also by two eminent Scottish divines, Drs Leechman and Blair, quotations from whom you will find in the ninth chapter of the "Constitution of Man." I here add the following sentiments expressed in "Theological Lectures at Westminster Abbey," by John Heylin, D.D., Prebendary of Westminster, and Rector of St Mary-le-Strand.†

Discoursing "concerning prayer," vol. i. p. 94, he says: *Your Father knoweth what things ye have need of, before ye ask him.* These words are highly instructive, and may serve to give us a solid and practical knowledge of the true nature of prayer. The proper end of prayer is not to inform God of our wants, nor to persuade him to relieve them. Omniscient as he is, he cannot be informed. Merciful as he is, he need not be persuaded. The only thing wanting is a fit disposition on our part to receive his graces. And the proper use of prayer is to produce such a disposition in us as to render us proper subjects for sanctifying grace to work in, or, in other words, to remove the obstacles which we ourselves put to his goodness."

The same views were taught by the philosophers of the last century. "The Being that made the world," says Lord Kames, "governs it by laws that are inflexible, because they are the best; and to imagine that he can be moved by prayers, oblations, or sacrifices, to vary his plan of government, is an

impious thought, degrading the Deity to a level with ourselves." His lordship's opinion as to the advantage of public worship, shews that he did not conceive the foregoing views of prayer to be in the least inconsistent with its reasonableness and utility. "The principle of devotion," he says, "like most of our other principles, partakes of the imperfection of our nature; yet, however faint originally, it is capable of being greatly invigorated by cultivation and exercise. Private exercise is not sufficient; nature, and consequently the God of nature, requires public exercise, or public worship: for devotion is communicative, like joy or grief; and, by mutual communication in a numerous assembly, is greatly invigorated. A regular habit of expressing publicly our gratitude and resignation never fails to purify the mind, tending to wean it from every unlawful pursuit. This is the true motive of public worship; not what is commonly inculcated—that it is required from us as a testimony to our Maker of our obedience to his laws. God, who knows the heart, needs no such testimony."**.

The objection that natural theology excludes devotion and praise, is equally unfounded. It no doubt excludes both, with the object of gratifying the Creator, by expressing to him our approbation of his works and government, as we would seek to please an earthly sovereign by addresses conveying to him our favourable opinion of his measures. But if our moral and religious sentiments be deeply penetrated with a sense of our own absolute dependence on his power, and with admiration of his greatness and goodness;—if our intellects be imbued with clear perceptions of his wisdom;—if our whole faculties flow towards his laws and institutions, with the most earnest desire to know and to obey them;—and if we have been created social beings, so that our souls expand in vigour, augment in vivacity, and rise into higher sublimity, by acting in concert in the presence of each other, it appears to me that every form of worship and devotion which shall give expression to these states of mind, is not only permitted, but enjoined by natural religion. It teaches us, however, humbly to regard ourselves as enjoying a vast privilege, and reaping an unspeakable enjoyment, in being thus permitted to lift up our minds to God; and it extinguishes the thought, as impious and unwarrantable, that, by our devotions, we can render God happier or better; or pay back, by any service of ours, his boundless gifts to us. Natural theology also discountenances every conception of our pleasing God by professions of respect which we do not feel, or of propitiating his favour by praises of his laws, while we neglect and infringe them. It also teaches that the whole of human kind are equally the children of God; because it demonstrates that He has formed after one pattern all the nations of the earth, governs them by the same laws, offers them the same means of happiness, and visits them with the same punishments when they transgress his statutes. Finally—It attaches no value to opinions, faith, or belief, apart from actions; because it shews that it is only by practically doing that which God has prescribed in the record of his will, that we can reap enjoyment or avoid evil. In short, it renders the *practice* of our duty a test of the *sincerity*, and the results of that practice a criterion of the *soundness* of our belief. This appears to me to be also the essential character of Christianity.

You will observe that in this summary there is no notice of punishment and reward, or of forgive-

* First Sermon on the Duty of Prayer.

† 1749—Tonson and Draper in the Strand, 48.

* Sketches, B. III., Sk. 3. ch. iii. § I. St Augustine states views substantially similar, in his 130th Epistle "To Proba," quoted in "The Church of the Fathers," 1840, p. 260.

ness for transgressions, in a future state. On this point natural theology, like the Jewish Dispensation, appears to me to be silent.

LECTURE XX.

OBJECTIONS CONSIDERED.

Clerical hostility to the scientific education of the people—Intellectual cultivation not only not adverse to practical Christianity, but favourable to its reception—Instance of the Hindoos—Mistaken views of religious persons in former times with respect to witchcraft—The Pope's method of averting cholera by a religious procession—Clerical hostility to Phrenology and the doctrine of the natural laws—These the allies, not the foes, of Christianity—Conclusion.

In concluding these Lectures, I beg your attention to a denouncement of the whole course of study in which we have been engaged, which appeared in the prospectus of *The Christian Herald*.* "All sorts of literary machinery, newspapers, lectures, treatises, magazines, pamphlets, school-books, libraries of knowledge, for use or for entertainment, are most diligently and assiduously set in motion, if not for purposes directly hostile to the gospel, at least on the theory that men may be made good and happy without the gospel; nay, though the gospel were forgotten as an old wives' fable. It were well if they who know the wretched infatuation of such views were alive to the importance of at least attempting to set similar machinery in motion for the production of a religious impression." The prospectus continues—"It is impossible, even if it were desirable, to check the current of cheap popular literature: but it may be possible, through faith and prayer, to turn it more nearly into a right channel." The impossibility of *checking*, is here assigned as the paramount reason for attempting to direct the current; whence we may infer that these respectable divines would have stopped it if they could. Let us inquire, therefore, with becoming deference, but with the freedom of men who have the privilege of thinking for themselves, into the grounds of these opinions and charges.

Let us assume, for the sake of argument, that the views of faith and doctrine entertained by our condemning censors are all sound; and let us suppose an angel to be sent from heaven to teach a celestial choral symphony to men, in order to prepare them, on entering the realms of bliss, to join in the strains of their new abode: This might be conceived, without imagining the angel to create new faculties—his object being only to *elevate*, quicken, and improve those that exist in human nature. This would be an illustration of the relation in which supernatural truths would stand to the moral and intellectual faculties of man. The truths of Scripture would not create new powers and organs in us; they would only purify, exalt, and guide those which we previously possessed. I observe farther, that, in this case those individuals who possessed the largest and the best cultivated organs of Tune and Time, would be in the best condition to profit by the angelic teacher's instructions; and I ask whether those individuals who enjoy the most vigorous and best exercised moral and intellectual faculties will not, by parity of

reason, be best prepared to profit by the lessons of Scripture?

How would it strike you, then, if the angelic teacher were to reproach the human professors of music, whom he found on earth instructing their pupils in the best music which they knew, and teaching them the practice of the art,—with the offence of treating the divine symphony as an old wives' fable? They might most reasonably answer, "O angel of light, we and our pupils are humble men, and we do not enjoy the gifts of inspiration. We cannot cause the solemn organ to roll forth its pealing strains, until we have studied its stops, and accustomed our mortal fingers to press its keys. We cannot make the dorian flute breathe its soft melodies, until we have learned its powers, and practised the delicate movements without which it yields only discordant sounds. We mean no disrespect to your heavenly air, but we mortal men cannot produce music at all until the mental faculties and bodily organs, on which musical skill depends, have been trained to the art, and we are now instructing ourselves in our own humble way. We are exercising our mental faculties and our physical powers, to bring them into a condition to hear, feel, comprehend, and execute the exalted duty which you assign to us. Do not, then, reprimand us for acting according to our nature; help and encourage us, and you will discover that those of us who have most assiduously studied and practised our earthly music will most readily and successfully acquire your heavenly strains."

The angel might blush at this reproof. But the simile is applicable to the divines who now denounce us, the teachers of natural science, as guilty of impiety. The truths of Scripture are addressed to the identical faculties with which we study human science. They are the same intellectual powers which judge of the evidence and import of Scripture, and of the truths of Chemistry, Geology, and Phrenology, and they are the same moral and religious sentiments which glow with the love of the God of the New Testament, and with that of the God of natural religion: nay, not only are the faculties the same, but their objects are the same. There are not two Gods, but one God; and there are not two lines of duty, but one law of obedience prescribed, in both of the records. Christianity is not diffused miraculously in our day: and unless the sentiments and intellectual powers to which it is addressed be previously cultivated by exercise and illuminated by knowledge, its communications fall on stony ground and take no root. In May 1835, the missionary, Mr Duff, told the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, that, in consequence of the minds of the Hindoos being entirely deficient in this previous exercise and training, the gospel appeared to them actually like an old wives' fable. He preached it in its purity and its might; yet it fell dead on their ears, and was lost. What remedy did he propose? To do the very thing for which we are now vituperated by our reverend pastors; he begged the Assembly to provide funds to enable him to teach the rudiments of physical science and the elements of useful knowledge to the Hindoos, to prepare them for comprehending the gospel. And he was right. The elements of science are the truths of God adapted by him to the constitution of the human faculties, just as the atmosphere is adapted by him to the human lungs, and the lungs to it. As the lungs are invigorated by respiring atmospheric air, so are the intellectual and moral faculties rendered alert and energetic, and prepared at once to discriminate and to appreciate truth, by the study of natural science. On the other hand, until they be so cultivated and quickened, they are the ready dupes of superstition, and are not prepared to reap

* The *Christian Herald* was a cheap weekly periodical, conducted by members of the Church of Scotland, and devoted exclusively to religion. The prospectus was issued in January 1836. It has since ceased or changed its title.

the full benefit even of Christianity. Reflect on the state of Spain, Portugal, and Italy, and you will learn the consequences of profound ignorance of natural science on the religious condition of the people. Gross superstition holds the place of rational devotion, and senseless ceremonies are the substitutes for practical morality.

Our own population are more enlightened than the people of these countries, but they still continue too ignorant of natural science, and particularly of the philosophy of mind. As neither they nor their clerical teachers appear to give due effect to the truth which I am now expounding,—that Christianity requires cultivated faculties before it can produce its full beneficial effects,—I beg leave to illustrate this proposition a little more in detail.

In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, divines and the people at large, both in England and Scotland, were in full possession of the Scriptures. The reformation was completed, and printing was in active operation; yet, in these centuries, clergymen sitting as judges condemned old women to the flames as witches. What was the cause of this barbarity? At that time there was neither physical nor mental science; the phenomena of nature were supposed to be under the influence of magicians, of evil spirits, and of the devil; and these unhappy women, the victims of ignorance, cruelty, and superstition, were believed to be in league with the powers of darkness. It was the dawn of physical science which opened up the creation to the human intellect, and revealed it as the vast domain of God; whereas, before that dawn, ignorant divines, with the Bible in their hands, had mistaken it for the realm of the devil. It was science that delivered the clergy and their flocks from the practice of cruelties, from which the unaided Bible had not sufficed to protect them. It is no disparagement to the Bible to say this, because it was never intended to supersede the study of God's works revealed in the records of creation; and, in falling into superstition, the clergy and people were incurring the penalty of having omitted to discharge that duty to God and to themselves.

Again, I mentioned to you at an early stage of these lectures, that when Rome was threatened with cholera, in the year 1835, the Pope and Cardinals carried a black image of the Virgin in solemn procession through the streets; while our public authorities, in similar circumstances, cleaned the whole city from filth, purified the alleys and confined courts by fumigation, provided wholesome food and clothing for the poor, and organized hospitals for the reception of the sick. What was the cause of this difference of conduct? Will our clergy represent the cause of this proceeding of the Italians to have been solely their want of the Bible? This may have been one cause; but it is notorious, that both in our own country and in Protestant Germany, although the laity enjoyed the Scriptures, they continued superstitious, fierce, and cruel, until human science dawned on their minds, and co-operated with the Bible in developing the spirit of Christianity. The Roman clergy and people were ignorant of physiology and the laws of the animal economy, and their dull minds perceived no connection between the disease and the condition of their bodies. Edinburgh, on the contrary, was the seat of an enlightened school of medicine, and her leading men discerned the connection between impure air, filth, low diet, and deficient clothing,—and disease of every kind. They therefore, although as ignorant as the Pope himself of the special causes of the cholera, knew how to act in conformity with the general principles of health. They were aware, that whatever tended to promote the strength of the body and the tranquility of the mind, would serve to abate the virulence even of an

unknown disease, and the result corresponded with their principles. Here the procession of the Virgin would have been regarded as a mockery of the human understanding, and an insult to the majesty of heaven. But how have we come to entertain views so much more rational than those of our Roman brethren? Not by exclusively studying the Scriptures; because the Pope and Cardinals who prescribed that procession certainly possessed the Scriptures, although they may have withheld them from their flocks; but by the study of the anatomy and physiology of the body, and the laws of the animal economy in general. It will be admitted that the citizens of Edinburgh acted the more purely Christian part in this emergency. Yet their superior knowledge of physical science was one great cause of their superior Christian practice. Why, then, should our clerical guides charge us with contempt of the Bible, because we teach the people the very knowledge which serves to render them willing, able, and intelligent co-operators with the plans of Providence in the natural world; which guards their minds from becoming the slaves of superstition; and which, by cultivating their moral and intellectual faculties, renders them apt learners of the precepts of Christianity?

But I am led to believe that Phrenology and the doctrine of the natural laws have specially attracted the displeasure of these clerical guides, and that phrenologists are considered to be particularly chargeable with the sin of aiming at making men "good and happy without the gospel." It is agreeable to find that we are charged with no worse offence, than attempting to make men "good and happy," even although our method of doing so be disapproved of. I admit that I do not teach the gospel in these lectures; neither do professors of Chemistry and Anatomy teach it in their courses. But the reason is, that it is the duty of the clergy themselves, and not that of the professors of natural science, to teach the gospel to the people.

What, however, does Phrenology teach? It teaches the organs, functions, uses, and abuses of each of our faculties; it shews us that the moral and intellectual powers are given to guide our inferior feelings; and it informs us that we must observe the organic laws in order to preserve our brains in health, otherwise our mental powers will be impeded and deranged in their action. It leads us, in short, to study ourselves, and our relations to the external world, and to practise the duties thence discoverable, as acts of obedience to the will of God. The result is, that instead of being lost in a mist of vague notions of what constitutes sin, and what righteousness, our disciples are enabled to distinguish good from evil, in the uses and abuses of their faculties: Instead of wandering amidst dark superstitions, and mistaking the natural impulses of the propensities for suggestions of the devil, and those of the moral and religious sentiments for direct influences from heaven, they recognise the true sources of both, and use the natural, and, therefore, the most successful means, to subdue the former, and to sustain, regulate, and direct the latter. They are taught to avoid the inconsistency of praying to God for health, or other benefits, while they blindly neglect every law of physiology on which health, or the realization of their other desires, depends. We urge the imperative necessity of first obeying God's laws of health, established in our constitution, and his other natural laws related to the objects prayed for; and then, and then only, to venture to ask him for his blessing and his benefits. Instead of seeing in the external world only a vast confusion of occurrences, in which sometimes the good triumph, and sometimes the wicked,—in which the imagination is bewildered, and the moral affections disappointed in not recognising God

—they are taught to study the different objects and beings in nature; to trace their relations and laws; to mark their uniformity of action, their beneficial applications, as well as their noxious influences; and to regulate their own conduct accordingly. Their eyes are thus opened to the magnificent spectacle of a world full of the wisdom and goodness of God, specially adapted by Him to man's moral and intellectual powers, pervaded in every department by an intelligible and efficient government, and the whole tending regularly and systematically to favour virtue, and to punish vice. They recognise the duties of temperance and activity, of moral, intellectual, and religious cultivation,—of affection to kindred,—of the love of mankind, and of God,—and, above all, of obedience to God's will,—to be engraven on their bodily and mental constitutions, and to be enforced by the external creation. Is it, then, treating the gospel as an old wives' fable, to teach the people such knowledge as this? Is it "a wretched infatuation," on our part, thus to prepare the mind, by a pure, invigorating, and elevating cultivation, to receive, profit by, and practise, the precepts of that very gospel itself? And what are these divines themselves doing?

I find, in a review of the *Christian Herald* in a London Newspaper,* the following remarks on this subject: "The natural world is too interesting to the human intellect to be quietly laid on the shelf, or to be forgotten as an old wives' fable, and inquiring minds will continue to study it in spite of denunciations such as those now cited. If the divines do not connect Christian theology with philosophy and science, they will every year find a spirit gaining strength against them, which will ultimately compel them to follow this course, at whatever trouble and disappointment to themselves. In this *Journal* (the *Christian Herald*) they treat the whole material creation with exactly the same neglect with which they accuse the authors of worldly literature and science, of treating Revelation; and with less show of reason. Scientific writers are entitled to say that this world comes first, and that, in unfolding its philosophy, they are preparing the way for the clergy to teach the doctrines that relate to futurity. But the clergy, in proceeding at once to the concerns of the next world, begin at the end. They proceed to tell the people how to reap the harvest, without teaching them how to cultivate and manure the soil, and how to sow the seed." These remarks are so directly applicable to the point under consideration, that I cannot add to their force. I only remark, further, that I have hitherto abstained from retaliation for the condemnation poured out against these lectures from the pulpit† and the press; and all that I now do is, respectfully to beg of you to consider, whether, if it be a truth in nature, that large, energetic, and well-exercised moral and religious organs are necessary to vigour of mind, and that obedience to God's natural laws is necessary to the profitable reception and practice of Christianity, divines would not be better employed in inquiring patiently into the truth of these propositions,—and if they find them to be true, in teaching and acting in accordance with them, and encouraging others to do the same,—than in shutting their eyes against the palpable light of God, and denouncing us as unfaithful to His cause, when only they themselves are ignominiously vilifying His institutions.

Again, Phrenology shews that moral and religious sentiments, enlightened by intellect, have been intended to guide the inferior faculties of man; and

by the study of political economy you will discover that the whole relations of the different members of the state, and also of different nations towards each other, uniformly produce good when regulated in accordance with the dictates of these faculties, and evil and suffering when they depart from them: that is to say, when the laws of any particular people approach to the closest conformity with the dictates of benevolence and justice, they become most beneficial to the whole public body, and when they depart from them, they become most injurious; also, when a nation in its treaties and relations with foreign states, acts on the principles of benevolence and justice, and limits its own exactions by these principles, it reaps the greatest possible advantages, while it suffers evil in proportion as it attempts to gain by selfishness, rapine, force, or fraud. These truths, I say, are rendered clear by the combined sciences of Phrenology, which proves the existence, nature, and objects of our moral faculties, and Political Economy, which unfolds the effects on human welfare of different political, economical, and legislative institutions and systems of action. I appeal to every man possessed of common understanding, whether teachers of such doctrines are or are not preparing the public mind for the practical development of that grand Christian condition of society, in which all men shall endeavour to act as brothers, and love their neighbours as themselves. Nay, not only so, but I request you to consider the futility of teaching these sublime precepts to a people left in the mazes of selfishness, which is their inevitable condition until their minds be imbued with the truth, that the world is actually constituted in harmony with the dictates of the moral sentiments of man.

Your time will not permit me to extend these remarks farther; but nothing would be more easy than to trace the whole circle of the sciences, and show how each of them, by unfolding the will of God in its own department, is a truth, a pioneer to the practical development of Christianity.

It is true that we do not carry them forward to these applications in our lectures, and I presume this is the ground of the charge against us: But why do we not do so? Because it is the peculiar and dignified province of the clergy themselves to apply them. Would you reproach the ploughman, who in spring tilled, manured, and sowed your field, because he had not in spring also, and with his plough for a sickle, reaped the crop? Equally unreasonably and unfounded is this charge against us. We are the humble husbandmen, tilling, manuring, and sowing the seeds of knowledge in the public mind, and to the clergy is allotted the not less important charge of tending the corn in its growth and reaping the golden harvest.

The cultivation of the moral nature of a being journeying through life on his way to a future state, bears the same relation to his preparation for eternity, that tilling and sowing in spring bear to the reaping of the fruits of harvest. It is clear, then, that if we are cultivating, enlightening, and improving the mental powers of our audiences for the duties imposed on them in this world, we are rendering them also fitter for the next; and that divines should dovetail their own instruction with ours, in so far as we disseminate truth, and should carry forward the pupils to whom we have taught the rudiments of natural knowledge, to the full perfection of rational and Christian men. But here the real cause of their hostility presents itself. They really do not yet know how to do so. Phrenology, which unfolds the uses and relations of the human faculties, and which, for the first time since man was created, enables him to discover

* The Courier of 17th March 1836.

† While these lectures were in course of being delivered, one of the ministers of Edinburgh preached against them.

his own position in the world which he inhabits, is a science as it were, only of yesterday. It is a recent discovery, and divines, in general, know little of it. Physiology, as a science of practical divines, is as young as Phrenology; because it is a recent discovery to perfection while the uses of the brain, and its influence, as the organ of the mind, over the whole of the animal economy, were unknown. Divines, therefore, do not yet know its relations to their own doctrines. Geology, which traces the past history of the globe, is also but of yesterday; while Chemistry and other physical sciences are all of recent introduction to the intellects of the people. The idea of employing these sciences at all in the moral and intellectual improvement of the great body of the people is new, and the notion of rendering that improvement subservient to Christianity is newer still; and our clergy, in general, are yet strangers to both ideas. The system on which they still rely was instituted when all education for the common people consisted in reading and writing, and for the higher ranks in Greek and Roman literature; and they feel uneasy at discovering a vast stream of knowledge rolling along the public mind, which has not emanated from themselves, and with which their system is not yet connected. Some of them have studied Phrenology, and become convinced of its truth; but they have shrunk from its consequences and applications. They have perceived the changes which it is destined to introduce into the theology of their several sects, and recoiled at the prospect. Too honest to deny the reality of natural truths which have forced themselves upon their conviction, yet too timid to encounter the storm of prejudice and vituperation which the public avowal and bold application of them, would bring upon them from their less enlightened brethren, they have quietly laid Phrenology on the shelf, and continued to float with the current of established opinion. We may lament such conduct, but cannot severely blame the individuals. The power of effectually stemming the tide of error is given only to a few, —and those from whom it is withheld may justly be excused for not fruitlessly becoming martyrs in a cause which, sooner or later, must triumph by its own inherent power. But the great majority of the clergy are ignorant of Phrenology as a science, and are honest in their opposition to its progress. This is their misfortune; and we should endure their denunciations with equanimity, as the result of imperfect knowledge, in the assured confidence, that whenever they discover that

they cannot arrest our course by declaiming against us, they will study the new philosophy, profit by its truths, and join the ranks of reformers; and that hereafter they and we shall be found labouring together for the public good. They and we are all engaged in one design. Theirs is the most exalted, most dignified, and most enviable vocation allotted to man; and I feel assured that in a few years they will find their strength, usefulness, and pleasure, unspeakably augmented by the very measures which we are now pursuing, and which they, not knowing what they do, are vilifying and obstructing.

Here, then, I conclude this course of lectures. It has embraced a mere sketch or outline of a mighty subject, and has been chargeable with many imperfections. I feel much gratified by the kind attention with which you have followed my observations. If they have conferred pleasure or instruction, my object will have been gained. If they shall prove the means of exciting your minds to follow out the study for your own improvement, I shall feel the highest satisfaction. I have spoken plainly and forcibly what appeared to myself to be true. If I have sometimes fallen into error (as what mortal is free from liability to err?) I shall be anxious to obtain sounder and juster views; but if I have in other instances given a more correct exposition of the order of the divine government of the world, and the principles of natural religion, than you previously possessed, I hope that, trusting in the power of truth, you will neither be startled at the novelty, nor offended by the consequences, of the ways of Providence, which I have expounded. You know your own position. You are the first popular audience in this city to whom the truths and the consequences of the new philosophy of mind discovered by Dr Gall have been unfolded; and you are aware that in every age the most useful and important truths have had to contend with violent prejudices when first promulgated. You have an admirable rule, however, prescribed to you for your guidance, in the advice given by Gamaliel to the high priest of the Jews. "If this counsel or this work be of men, it will come to nought; but if it be of God, you cannot overthrow it." (Acts, v. 38.) If I have truly interpreted to you any of the works and ways and laws of the Almighty, his arm will give efficacy to my instruction: If I have erred, my words will come to nought. In either event truth will triumph, and we shall all become wiser and better.

THE END.

